Vol. LXI. No. 4 October, 1919

The Ecclesiastical Review

Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

EUCHARISTIC PREACHING 353
The Rev. JOSEPH H. McMAHON, Ph.D., New York City.
ECCLESIASTICAL LEGISLATION ON THE "MISSA PRO POPULO" 336
The Rev. ALBERT F. KAISER, C.PP.S., Carthagena, Ohio.
PRACTICAL WAYS OF PROMOTING FREQUENT COMMUNION, PARTICULARLY AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE 371
The Rev. FREDERICK A. HOUCK, Toledo, Ohio.
THE LONELINESS OF THE PRIEST 382
Fr. ANGELO, O.F.M., Portland, Oregon.
THE ECCLESIASTICAL OUTLOOK IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA 392
The Rev. BEDE HORSA, O.S.B., St. Benedict, Louisiana.
AFFINITY AND THE NEW CODE 396
The Rev. THOMAS SLATER, S.J., Liverpool, England.
THE CHURCH AS A SOCIAL CENTRE AND SETTLEMENT WORKER 402
AN OBSERVER.
MISSIONARIES IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS 410
The Rev. FRANCIS X. J. EXLER, O. Praem., Corregidor, Philippine Islands.
DIVORCE IN THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH 413
The Rev. PAUL J. SANDALGI, Curtis Bay, Maryland.
THE LAYMEN'S LEAGUE OF GEORGIA 416
The Right Rev. BENJAMIN J. KEILEY, D.D., Bishop of Savannah.
MORAL ASPECT OF THE "MISSA PRO POPULO" 424
THE NEW CODE AND DAILY MEDITATION FOR THE CLERGY 427
WEST POINT MILITARY CHAPEL 429
The Rev. HENRY F. O'KEEFFE, C.S.P., New York City.
THE PRIEST AND CHURCH ARCHITECTURE 437
I. The Rev. HENRY A. JUDGE, S.J., New York City.
II. The Rev. FRANCIS E. WALSH, Camp Grove, Illinois.
III. The Rev. WILLIAM A. BUSCH, L.M.H.S., St. Paul Minnesota.
MISSIONARY EFFORT IN OUR OWN LAND 441
I. The Rev. FRANCIS T. MORAN, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio.
II. The Rev. THOMAS F. COAKLEY, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa.
THE RETREAT FOR ARMY CHAPLAINS 451
The Rev. JOSEPH STETTNER, M.S.C., Sparta, Wisconsin.
RECENT BIBLE STUDY: Whither? An Anglican Query 452
The Rev. WALTER DRUM, S.J., Woodstock, Maryland.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
1305 Arch Street THE DOLPHIN PRESS Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1919: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.50
London, England: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row Melbourne, Australia: W. P. Linehan, 309 Little Collins St.
Entered, 5 June, 1889, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

St. Bernard's Seminary O-Neh-Da Vineyard

ALTAR WINE

For Sacramental Purposes

ON account of the increased cost of labor and of materials used in shipping Altar Wines and of a recently imposed government tax we find it necessary to revise our prices as indicated below. We take occasion to call attention to the reliability of the wine and to its superior qualities. The wine is made according to the rules of the Church **under the personal supervision of the Right Reverend Thomas F. Hickey, Bishop of Rochester, who gives his guarantee to the purity of the wine.** It is both licit and valid matter for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

Revised List—Fall of 1919

GRADES AND PRICES

Ordinary Altar Wine, made from Concord, Catawba and Worden Grapes.
Bottled, 5 gallons in 25 bottles $12.50
In bulk, 1 keg 10 gallons 20.00
In bulk, 1 keg 23½ gallons 45 00
In bulk, 1 barrel 46 gallons 80.00

Elvira Altar Wine, made exclusively from the Elvira grape, sold only in bottles
5 gallons in 25 bottles 14 00

Superior Altar Wine, made exclusively from Delaware, Brighton or Salem grape, sold only in bottles
5 gallons in 25 bottles 16.00

War Tax Additional **No Dealer has this Wine for sale.**

Kindly advise method of transportation—Freight or express.

Address all communications to REV. M. J. NOLAN, Chancellor, 72 Frank Street, Rochester, N. Y.

ALTAR WINES BEYOND DOUBT

L'ADMIRABLE
Kegs, per gal.
12 Bottles,
50 Bottles,

NOVITIATE
Kegs, per gal.
12 Bottles,
50 Bottles,

VILLA JOSEPH
Kegs, per gal.
12 Bottles,
50 Bottles,

MALVOISIE
Kegs, per gal.
12 Bottles,
50 Bottles,

Capacity of kegs, 5, 10, and 22 gals.

For Sacramental Purposes

(COPY) SACRED HEART NOVITIATE
Los Gatos, Cal., January 2nd, 1918.

BARNSTON TEA COMPANY, 6 Barclay Street, New York.

Gentlemen: With great pleasure we send you our greetings for the year 1918.

Judging from your sales in 1917, the Eastern Clergy must realize more and more the absolute purity of our Novitiate Wines and the reliability of your Agency.

Our books show that during the past twelve months we shipped to your Company in sealed carloads:

2,797½ Gallons ..... Admirable
14,728 Gallons ..... Sweet Novitiate
7,799 Gallons ..... Villa Joseph
5,448½ Gallons ..... Malvoisie

There was therefore an increase of 6,666½ gallons over the shipments of 1916.

Trusting to hear of still greater sales in 1918, and thanking you most cordially for the faithful and most conscientious performance of your duties as our sole Eastern Agent,

Very sincerely yours, THE SACRED HEART NOVITIATE,

Pres.

Sole Eastern Agents

Barnston Tea Company, 6 Barclay St., New York

Established 1870

Forty-eight Years as Dealers in Valid and Licit

ALTAR WINES

For Sacramental Purposes

The Donnelly Brothers

respectfully call attention to their popular Altar Wines, popular because of their proven purity and agreeableness for use when fasting.

"Collegiate" "Pureza Light" "Mission San Gabriel"
"Donnelly Bros. Special" "Pureza Dark" "San Patricio"

Satisfaction Guaranteed. ***A Trial Order Solicited.***

The Donnelly Brothers, Troy, N. Y.

CONTENTS CONTINUED

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

The Church as a Social Centre and Settlement Worker. (*An Observer*)...402
Missionaries in the Philippine Islands. (*The Rev. F. X. J. Exler, O. Praem., Chaplain, U. S. A.*)...410
Divorce in the Orthodox Eastern Church. (*The Rev. Paul J. Sandalgi, Curtis Bay, Maryland*)...413
Laymen's League of Georgia. (*The Right Rev. Benjamin J. Keiley, D.D., Savannah, Georgia*)...416
Maryknoll Mission Letters. VII. (*The Revs. J. E. Walsh and F. X. Ford, MM.Ap., Yeungkong, Kwangtung, China*)...417
Moral Aspect of the "Missa pro Populo"...424
The New Code and Daily Meditation for the Clergy...427
West Point Military Chapel. (*The Rev. Henry E. O'Keeffe, C.S.P., New York City*)...429
Our Altars. (*The Rev. Henry A. Judge, S.J., New York City*)...436
Building an Altar and Church Architecture:
I. The Rev. Francis E. Walsh, Camp Grove, Illinois...437
II. The Rev. William A. Busch, L.M.H.S., St. Paul, Minnesota...439
Accepting Money on Sick Calls...440
Missionary Effort in Our Own Land. (*The Rev. Francis T. Moran, D.D., Cleveland, Ohio*)...441
A Spiritual Militia. (*The Rev. Thomas F. Coakley, D.D., Pittsburgh, Pa.*)...443
"Dancing Parties" and the Council of Baltimore...445
Confessions of Religious "for the Peace of their Conscience"...446
Wax Candles for the Altar...447
Forty Hours' Devotion on All Souls' Day...448
Burial Mass on All Souls' Day...449
Was the Marriage Legal?...449
Footgear in the Celebration of the Mass...450
Retreat for Army Chaplains. (*The Rev. Joseph Stettner, M.S.C., Sparta, Wisconsin*)...451

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Bible Study: Whither? An Anglican Query. (*The Rev. Walter Drum, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland*)...452

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:

Christian Brothers: Course of Religious Instruction—The Catechist's Manual...460
Brownson: To the Heart of the Child...460
MacEachen: Catechist's Manual—First Elementary Course...460
Baierl: The Creed Explained—An Aid to Catechists...460
Inge: The Philosophy of Plotinus...464
Aurelianus: Cursus Asceticus...468
Louismet: The Mystical Life...470
Louismet: Mysticism—True and False...470
Devas: From Cloister to Camp...472
Keable: Standing By—War-Time Reflections...472
Gore: The Church and the Ministry...474
Papi: The Government of Religious Communities...476
Alexander: Letters to Teachers...477

LITERARY CHAT...480

BOOKS RECEIVED...487

ENRICH YOUR LIBRARY

WITH A

SET OF THE REVIEW

OF RECENT MONTHS there has been quite a brisk turn-over of back copies of the REVIEW. We have been advertising for some numbers to help complete the files of some of our subscribers, and they are still in search of other back copies. If you need some back copies or volumes, or if you have them to dispose of, now is the time to write.

✣ ✣ ✣ ✣

The increased activity in this department is doubtless due to the publication of the INDEX of the first fifty volumes of the REVIEW. The INDEX has proved itself a most useful volume, both for those who have all the volumes of the REVIEW and those who have only a few volumes. Subscribers who have not yet got a copy of the INDEX can procure one ($3.00 postpaid).

The following **Back Copies of REVIEW are wanted.** Of other issues we have an ample supply.

1918—Jan., Feb., March, May and June
1917—Jan., March, Sept., Oct. and Nov.
1916—March
1914—Jan. and June
1896—Feb. to Aug., Oct. and Nov.
1895—Jan., Feb., March, and July to Dec.
1894—Feb. March, May, Sept. and Oct.
1893—Feb., March, and June to Dec.
1892—Jan., March, April, June and Dec.
1891—Any or all numbers
1890—Any or all numbers
1889—All but Jan. and April

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SEVENTH SERIES.—VOL. I.—(LXI).—OCTOBER, 1919.—No. 4.

EUCHARISTIC PREACHING.[1]

EVERY earnest pastor must feel qualms of conscience from time to time when some specially saddening lapse from grace or peculiarly miserable failure in his parish will suggest the uncomfortable thought that perhaps his people are not receiving the proper spiritual pabulum in the way of the preaching of the word of God. The task of determining what is best to offer is indeed bewildering, delicate, difficult: bewildering because of the vastness of the field of subjects from which to choose, the variety offering in every portion of that extensive range, the complexity of implication in every subject chosen; delicate, because of the nicety of judgment required to determine whose are the most pressing needs among the different portions of the flock; difficult, because of the effort needed to realize that, diverse as may be the spiritual, moral, intellectual stratification of the congregation, all these different elements have a right to the highest things of religion as well as to its commonplaces.

At first blush it would appear that there should be no difficulty in naming the Holy Eucharist as transcendently the most important and compelling subject of our preaching. The very nature of Its content, the universal need for Its life-sustaining nourishment, the completeness of Its powers of sanctification, would seem to make It indeed the sole theme of our discourse. Apparently, however, the tradition of Christian preaching runs contrary to such an assumption. As far as we can learn, the early Church, perhaps through fear of treachery, perhaps be-

[1] Read before the Convention of the Priests' Eucharistic League, Notre Dame University, Indiana.

cause of the *Disciplina Arcani*, did not preach the Eucharist to the faithful so much as feed It to them. St. Paul devotes very little of his instruction to Its explication. The Eucharistic preaching of the early Greek and Latin Fathers is abundant but not overwhelming in comparison with the other topics discussed in homilies and discourses. St. Vincent Ferrer at a later date in his marvelous missionary progress makes the terrors of judgment the burthen of his preaching. St. Bernardine of Siena extols the Holy Name where perhaps we should have looked for the Blessed Sacrament.

The subject of preaching, it would seem, therefore, is to be determined not by considerations of absolute importance but of relative need. Judged by this criterion the preaching of the Eucharist should be paramount at the present time because unmistakably it is needed now (1) more than the preaching of any other in the wide range of religious truths, and perhaps, (2) more than at any other period in the history of the Church.

If we may begin with the second assertion, reflect upon the moral and spiritual conditions that confront us in this country, conditions that, as far as we can learn, are rapidly becoming duplicated in the countries of Continental Europe as well as in England. They very closely approximate those that enveloped the early Christians of Greece and Rome. With the latter it was question of emerging from paganism while still living surrounded by it and subject to the lure of its seductive sensualism. With us paganism, never entirely dead, is enjoying a well nigh universal renascence that threatens to engulf our own people, as it most certainly has conquered apparently every other group of those professing, nominally at least, Christianity. As in the early Church the Eucharist was the chief antidote to the pestilence of paganism, so must It be now with respect to neopaganism. The significant fact to remember is that then charity glowed in the hearts of the Christians while the Spirit of Truth illumined their minds. The charismata were visibly in evidence.

The preaching of Jesus Christ Crucified but Risen was apparently the talisman most potent to win Jew and Gentile. Love for the Person of Christ being awakened, and the consciousness of liberation from the thraldom of the Law and of sin stirring in the heart thrilled with the sense of the new

dignity conferred upon human nature by its union with Divinity, it was not difficult to secure the union of the individual with that Sacred Person in the Communion of the Blessed Sacrament. The vital Faith of the Middle Ages made participation of the Body and Blood of Christ a matter of course. Religion, then, was a Life, not merely a doctrine: and the Life was also "the Way and the Truth". But there came the blight of Jansenism and the chill of intellectual criticism. Polemics succeeded to exposition and exhortation. Religious life withered. Formalism in great measure stifled vital devotion. Arnauld's treatise and St. Cyran's preaching on Frequent Communion typify the Tantalus of modern spiritual life, holding to the lips of thirsting humanity the Cup of Eternal Life, but thwarting its efforts to quaff of its contents.

It required the drastic decrees of Pius X to awaken the Universal Church to a sense of the dry rot that not only threatened but had largely supervened in the devotional life of the Church. The vigor that astonishes us in our contemplation of the Ages of Faith, that made it possible for the mother to receive the Body of the Lord while the lips of her suckling babe were moistened with the Precious Blood; that stamped its living reality even upon the commonest forms of speech, will not return until energetic, persistent and uncompromising preaching of these decrees now happily embedded in the codified law of the Church shall have restored normal life to its membership throughout the world.

While we have every reason to be grateful to God for the alacrity with which all over the earth the people have responded to the call of Pius to strive to attain to the standard of Catholic living expressed in the practice of truly frequent and even daily Communion, while the heart of every priest is gladdened at the sight of the rows upon rows that throng the altar rail wherever the people are given a fair chance, still we must not fail to realize that it will only be by persistent interpretation of the mind of the Church that we can hope to dislodge the tainted teaching, disarm the suspicions, uproot the prejudices, destroy the inimical customs, extirpate the subtle pride that for centuries until now have directed erroneously the thoughts, yearnings and practice of the faithful with respect to the Blessed Sacrament in so many parts of the globe.

A careful reading of the history of the practice of Holy Communion would, I am sure, make every priest enthusiastic to preach the new Crusade for the restoration of sound Catholic usage to which Pius X summoned us as the great need of the day in the work of restoring all things in Christ.

For, secondly, we must consider that in our country particularly, where our people are so constantly and generally exposed to the infiltrations not only of Protestantism but of the indifferentism, materialism, and hedonism that have developed in the course of its disintegration and its assimilation with the unlovely elements that have come to it from naturalistic philosophies, there is urgent need (1) of sound and thorough instruction in the fundamentals of revealed religion, and (2) of the supernal strength to enable us to resist the seductive influences of that paganism that is rapidly destroying all appreciation of the standards of Christian morality or supplanting them with those of mere natural ethics, that is obliterating the fine delicacy of modesty and the exquisite refinement of reticence which safeguard virtue, that is developing an egoism whose desire for comfort and pleasure is gnawing at the vitals of social life, undermining marriage, dimming the sense of its sanctity and responsibilities, making material success and present enjoyment the goal of effort and ambition, subtly eliminating those ideas of penance, sacrifice, resignation that are basic in Christian life; and (3) of the flame of fire of mysticism that shall bring the glowing radiance of heroic sanctity into the sordidness, soddenness, selfishness, sybaritism of contemporary life, and thus shall make sainthood not a gleaming aureole of the past but a shining stimulus in the present.

Now these three compelling needs can best and most adequately be satisfied by the suitable preaching of the Holy Eucharist.

I. This great mystery is God: "Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in saecula" (Rom. 9:5). "Ecce tabernaculum Dei cum hominibus et habitabit cum eis. Et ipsi populus ejus erunt, et ipse Deus cum eis erit eorum Deus" (Apoc. 21:3). Its explanation, therefore, covers the entire range of theology, the treatise on God, especially on God the Redeemer and Sanctifier. One of the faults in our Eucharistic preaching is the restrained view that we take of it. I

venture to say that the situation so graphically described by Fr. Tesnière of the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament in the admirable introduction with which he prefaces his valuable *Somme de la Prédication Eucharistique*[2] can easily be taken as true of to-day, although three decades have elapsed since it was penned. His examination of the Retreats of First Communion published in such numbers then, as now, revealed the fact that out of three instructions daily for four days, only one dealt with the Eucharist, and that sometimes was occupied with sacrilegious communions. In the pulpit of his day the Eucharist was treated of only on those days when it would have been out of place to speak on any other theme; for instance, on the Fourth Sunday in Lent.

The sermon-books of that time contain one or two sermons on the Real Presence, on frequent Communion as then understood, and on the fruits of the Holy Sacrifice. Are conditions so very different with us? May we not with him plead that in our oral teaching the Blessed Sacrament may be given a place proportionate to that which it occupies in the divine economy? Space will not permit me to even run through the different heads of theological teaching that are embraced in any adequate teaching of the Holy Eucharist. Nor could I add anything to the stimulating conspectus that may be found in those interesting pages of Father Tesnière to which I would most earnestly refer the reader. One heading more, I might venture to suggest, and that is the explanation to our people of the sublime sequence and liturgical hymns of the Blessed Sacrament Mass and office. When we consider on one hand the vast treasures of knowledge that are stored up in the theology of the Blessed Sacrament and how few of these we distribute among the people, are we not compelled to admit that against us might truly be directed the reproach of the Baptist, "Medius vestrum stetit quem vos nescitis"?

II. But I have noted that this preaching must be suitable, and that (1) to our times, (2) to our people, (3) to the genius of our country.

(1) Our education should equip us with the culture that will enable us to translate into intelligible English the great

[2] Vol. I, p. viii ff.

thoughts of Fathers and scholastics, their penetrating explanations or at least illustrations of the profound truths locked up in the mystery of the Eucharist. But I insist that we must speak the language of to-day understanded of the man in the street. Scholastic terminology needs no defence, as those will understand who have read the scintillating Introduction to Harper's *Metaphysics of the School.* It requires not merely an intelligent understanding of technical terms, but a comprehensive and sympathetic knowledge of the workings of the contemporaneous human mind to be able to present the meaning of those terms in language that the average man of to-day will be able to grasp. Yet unless we know intimately the scholastic terminology we can make no headway in studying the theology of the Eucharist in its sources, and unless we are thoroughly acquainted with the literature of our tongue we can not interpret properly or adequately the subtle teachings of our great theologians who have gone as deeply into this transcendent subject as human intellect may go. It is pathetic to hear preachers talking glibly about essence and existence, substance and accident, space and extension, terms that are meaningless to the listeners in the pews, unless interpreted by illustrations or explanations that will relate them to the ordinary things of life. Those who have enjoyed the new experience of flying above the clouds say that all sense of space and motion is destroyed because of the disappearance of visible and fixed marks. This will make us realize the necessity of mastering the content of those quaint terms that the School evolved in its searching analysis of Truth, because otherwise we shall never grasp fully the great ideas that the theologians led by St. Thomas have elucidated concerning this memorial of all the wonderful works of the Lord and so must fail in interpreting them to the people.

I may be permitted two further observations. I can not sympathize with the attitude maintained by a not inconsiderable number of the clergy that the Holy Eucharist is a mystery so profound and so sacred that it should not be preached indiscriminately to the multitude. There is here no *profanum vulgus.* Such a conception is contrary to the intention of our Saviour in instituting this Sacrament Divine and it is opposed to the spirit of Holy Church. We should never forget that this Sacrament was designed to perpetuate, to diffuse gen-

erally and so to vulgarize the great fact of the Incarnation and Redemption. Its Author preached the miraculous figures, the divine origin, the incomprehensible secrets, the vital influences of the Eucharist to the motley crowd, not to the chosen few.[3] It must not be forgotten that the Eucharist, being a necessary means of salvation, ought to be accessible to all intellectually as well as actually. The Church has no doubt of the aptitude of the faithful to receive and enjoy the truths of faith. So the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "Verum quae de hujus admirabilis sacramenti virtute et fructibus dici possunt, nullum esse genus fidelium existimandum est ad quos earum rerum cognitio non pertineat et quibus maxime necessaria videri non debeat. Ut enim Eucharistiae utilitatem fideles intelligant, ob eam potissimum causam quae de hoc sacramento tam multis verbis disseruntur, cognoscenda sunt. Sed quoniam immensae ejus utilitates et fructus nulla oratione explicari possunt, unus aut alter locus a pastoribus tractandus erit, ut ostendant quae in sacrosanctis illis mysteriis bonorum omnium copia et affluentia inclusa sit."[4]

It has been my good fortune to listen to some of the admittedly greatest preachers of recent times in the English tongue. I have heard these men treat of the highest and deepest themes of Catholic theology to congregations composed of the usual elements of our Catholic people. I remember on one occasion when one of these gifted men addressed a crowded church on the meaning of the unitive way and described in burning words the union of the soul with God. I saw the humblest, yea even illiterate people in that audience drinking in those simple words in a manner that left no doubt whatever as to the fact of the comprehension of their meaning: and I could sympathize with the awe of a renowned ascetic preacher of Retreats whom I saw straining eagerly in his seat in the sanctuary under the spell of this master when he told me afterward that he marveled at the ease and fluency and undoubted success with which these high doctrines that he found it so difficult to set before the elect of God were expounded to and absorbed by that very mixed congregation of God's ordinary people.

[3] Tesnière, op. cit., p. xii.

[4] *Cat. Conc. Trid.*, P. II[a], C. CLVII.

I was privileged to hear that incomparable preacher Father Maturin discourse with torrential eloquence on two of the great Eucharistic truths, the idea of sacrifice and the reality of the Eucharistic sacrifice. There could be no mistake as to the fact that by means of his superb though simple language, his complete mastery not only of the old scholastic doctrine but of the recent French and English literature of the subject, his marvelous ability to clothe his deep reasoning in words, precise, intelligible, and used in their everyday meaning, he taught not only the theologians in the sanctuary but the laity in the pews a clearer idea of sacrifice than they had ever gleaned before from books or words: while his oratorical climax on the Mass in which he made his hearers realize that they must even see the dust clouds, feel the shimmering heat, smell the foul odors of sweat and human blood as on Calvary, made an impression that I am certain caused them thereafter to visualize and identify more expressly the One Bloody Sacrifice and its unbloody perpetuation.

The second observation I should like to make is to insist on accuracy in every attempt to garb the theological teaching of the Eucharist in modern or more precisely contemporary language and incidentally to point out the necessity for absolute honesty and frankness in reviewers of theological works. One of the best specimens of recent effort to make known to the ordinary reader the great teachings of scholastics on the Incarnation and its extension in the Holy Eucharist is Dom Vonier's *The Personality of Christ*. But although it flatly contradicts the usual devotional terminology concerning the humiliation of Christ in the Eucharist, and makes odd reading if taken in connexion with the chapter devoted to that subject in *Jesus Living in the Priest* or with the opinion given so clearly by Franzelin in his Tract *de Eucharistia* (Thesis X), yet in none of the reviews of it that I came across at the time of its publication did I find mention of any warning that the matter was at least controverted. But more remarkable still: in the subsequent chapter on "The Blood of Christ" there is a discussion of a highly technical matter belonging to the domain of physics. As from my own slight acquaintance with the subject his contention seemed insupportable because physiologically inaccurate, I had the passage submitted to an acknowledged

expert, who apparently rejected the physical data on which the conclusion was based. Yet in no review of this otherwise admirable book was there mention of this important matter. I submit that, as we priests engaged in absorbing parochial work can not be expected to be experts or specialists, we should be guaranteed security in the books that are recommended to us and that it is a dangerous proceeding for incompetent critics to sit in judgment, or for those who are competent not to be thorough in passing judgment upon those treatises to which of necessity we must look for information, enlightenment, and guidance. "Caeci quando caecos ducunt!"

(2) In our Eucharistic preaching we must always keep before our minds that our people need to be drawn by love and not by fear alone. The Reign of the Eucharist is the Reign of Love. Love is the silver side of sorrow. Too much insistence on its other side is calculated to overdevelop the fear that chills Love. The declaration, frank and unequivocal, of Pius X that freedom from mortal sin is the sole essential condition for even daily Communion has done more to stimulate spiritual life among our people than all the volumes of theological distinctions and subtleties evolved in the last few centuries by saints and moralists. These silken threads bound fast millions of souls whom Pius X's teaching would have emancipated.

Two important lacunæ are noticeable in our Catholic life in this country. We for the most part are suffering either from the loss or the decay of the liturgical sense, that great safeguard of Faith revealing the ever present Spirit of God. With the hideous travesty imposed by the tyranny of secular music out of the way, by strict compliance with the *Proprio Motu* and with the fervent, accurate, even impassioned explanation of the Sacrifice of the Mass, may we not hope to see our churches once more thronged with the people whose thirst for the stateliness of public worship has never been quenched though scarcely ever satisfied?

An even greater want is the cult of the higher spiritual life. The practical American mind has unintelligently weighed the contemplative life and found it wanting. Many of our Catholic people have become infected with the same poisonous judgment. We Catholics are as prone as our neighbors to weigh everything in the scale of the dollar and of material success. Why

is it that we have not produced the heroic sanctity that has distinguished the church in other portions of the globe? How comes it that within one hundred and twenty-five years of the landing of Columbus, Lima gives its fragrant Rose to our altars, to be followed by the long litany of saintly bishops, missionaries, and nuns in the Latin Americas, while our soil is still apparently arid? Is not the preaching of the Eucharist, so that the *Panis Angelorum* may indeed become the *cibus viatorum*, needed to widen the spiritual horizon of our people, make them realize the nearness of God, develop in them the mysticism that flames so easily into sainthood, cause them to weigh things in God's balance, make them strive to imitate the life of angels and elders who bow down continually before the Great White Throne hymning the praises of God as the highest form of prayer?

(3) Finally we must never forget in our preaching that (a) every nation has its own spirit, personal and incommunicable, and we are at last a nation; (b) that we priests are handicapped in the first place by reason of the fact that our studies are made in Latin, and that we have to learn to transmute rather than translate our Latin-moulded thoughts into English idiomatic speech; (c) that the literature upon which we mostly draw is foreign and must be recast if it is to be profitable. Our people are not as emotional as those of other countries nor as sentimental in their religion. They demand facts as well as sighs and exclamations. Their faith needs to be bulwarked by reason, as it must live not in the fervid environment of Catholicism but in the blight of naturalism. Our knowledge of the Eucharist then, in order to be available to their profit must first be strained through the intellectual atmosphere of our country and must pass through the crucible of our own hearts, there to acquire the stamp of genuine affection that shall make it pass current as real among our people.

JOSEPH H. MCMAHON.

New York.

ECCLESIASTICAL LEGISLATION ON THE "MISSA PRO POPULO".

THE legislation of the Church regarding the "Missa pro populo" may conveniently be divided into three parts historically: that of the Council of Trent and its committees, that of Benedict XIV, and the present Code.

The Council of Trent explicitly says: ". . . It is by divine precept enjoined upon all to whom the care of souls is committed . . . to offer up sacrifice for them".[1] From the many responses given by the committees of this Council we glean: "All *parochi* are by divine right obliged to offer and apply the Mass for their parishioners, with this distinction: those having sufficient revenues, daily; those with only meager and insufficient income, at least on all Sundays and feasts." That this obligation was meant to bind *sub gravi ex justitia* is clear from the fact that it was imposed on all pastors, not excepting those with insufficient revenues, under penalty of censure, excommunication, suspension, and interdict, and with the express prohibition of accepting any stipend on these days.[2]

Benedict XIV in his Encyclical *Cum semper oblatas* (14 August, 1744), did away with the difficult and odious distinction between amply-funded and paltry-funded pastors, by obliging all without distinction to offer up the "Missa pro populo" only on Sundays and those feasts on which the faithful were bound to hear Mass. He likewise granted special faculties to bishops to dispense pastors who had insufficient revenues from applying the "Missa pro populo" on the appointed Sundays and feasts themselves (on which days they could accept the free-will offerings of the faithful), provided they should celebrate such omitted Masses during the week.[3] Similarly he restated the power given to the bishops by the Council of Trent (Session II, Ch. 7), viz. of enlarging the income of (temporary) vicars of vacant churches, whose revenues were otherwise insufficient, on account of the burden of saying the Mass ("onus celebrandi"). And in some places where a part of the proceeds accrued to the general treasury of the Holy See he permitted the respective vicars to supply the meager-

[1] Session 23 Ref. Ch. I; Hebrews 5: 1-3.

[2] Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, Vol. V, sub verbo Missa, art. III, nn. 3, 4, 5, 6, 10.

[3] St. Alphonsus, *Theol. Moral.*, Vol. VI, No. 325.

ness of their returns from this fund (i. e. by deducting the required amount from their tribute to Rome). Regarding perpetual and temporary vicars he insisted on carrying out the law of Pius V, i. e. allowing them a prescribed portion of the parish funds. And if this allotted portion were still insufficient, he granted permission to such vicars to accept a stipend for the "onus celebrandi Missam pro populo".[4]

The New Code indicates a slight simplification and a few changes in the matter. As regards the nature, subjects, and circumstances of the present legislation, we note a few new points that are of vital importance for the American pastor. All pastors are bound by a special, personal, temporal, local, and real obligation to celebrate and apply the Mass for the people entrusted to their care. The obligation is special, not in virtue of orders or of benefice or of revenues, but of the pastoral office and of the quasi-contract in justice made by the pastor when assuming the "cura animarum". *Per se* it is personal, since the command of the Church is that it be performed by the pastor himself, unless he be legitimately hindered. It is temporal, hence, if possible, must be celebrated on the days prescribed in law. It is local, hence must be celebrated in the parish church, unless circumstances demand or persuade otherwise. (The local obligation binds only the parish priest and his equivalents). It is real, binding always; hence, if temporarily impeded, it must be applied as soon as possible (Can. 339). If the pastor for some canonical cause, such as pressing need, legitimate absence, or illness, be prevented either entirely or for a long time from saying the Mass himself he must have it applied through a substitute.[5] Ordinarily the *Missa pro populo* is the parochial Mass celebrated by the pastor. It need not be a high Mass; a low Mass suffices.[6] No stipend may be accepted for the application thereof, although there may be some bonus allowed on the extrinsic title of a particular onus such as chanting the Mass, etc. The *Missa pro populo* is applied

[4] *Cum semper oblatas*, commented on by Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*.

[5] S. C. C., 24 August, 1867; Goepfert, *Moral*, III, 87; St. Alphonsus, *Moral Theology*, Vol. VI, No. 326.

[6] Bouix, *De Parocho*, p. 575; Bargilliat, *Praelectiones J. C.*, Ed. 31ª, No. 1109.

only to the living (not the dead), since it is for the flock entrusted to the pastor's keep and care.[7]

The term pastor in this connexion includes three categories: (1) residential bishops, *abbates nullius vel prelati nullius,* vicars and prefects apostolic, vicars capitular, and apostolic administrators; (2) parish priests and quasi-parish priests; (3) parochial vicars, both perpetual and temporary, provided the latter possess full power. A perpetual vicar curate is one having actual responsibility of an habitual parochus, or moral person (such as cathedral or collegiate chapters).

Residential bishops, as soon as they enter their see, irrespective of the amount of income or any cause whatsoever, must apply the *Missa pro populo* on all Sundays and other feasts of precept, even those suppressed. The term suppressed feasts does not refer to those contained in the *Motu Proprio* of Pius X now tacitly suppressed by the new Code; [8] nor to any of the general feasts to be suppressed in the future (as Ferreris held), but to the time-honored Urban list.[9]

On the feast of Christmas one Mass is offered *pro populo.* Whenever any of the prescribed feasts falls on Sunday, the one Mass of the Sunday will satisfy the obligation. If any feast is transferred in such a way that not only the office and the Mass, but also the double precept of hearing Mass and abstaining from servile work are transferred, then the *Missa pro populo* must be applied on the day *to which* the transfer is made; otherwise on the day *from which* the transfer is made. Furthermore in parochial churches having *one Mass,* the parish

[7] Chas. Augustine, O.S.B., *Commentary on Code,* Vol. II, p. 552; Noldin, *Moral.,* Vol. III, N. 181.

[8] *Acta Ap. Sed.,* Vol. III, p. 391.

[9] The Urban list contains at most eighty-eight feasts (eighty-seven in U. S., since the Immaculate Conception is both a universal feast and our national patron feast):

(a) all Sundays of the year (fifty-two);

(b) eight feasts of our Lord and two of the Holy Ghost: Circumcision, Epiphany, Easter Monday and Tuesday, Finding of the Cross, Ascension, Pentecost Monday and Tuesday, Corpus Christi, Christmas;

(c) five feasts of B. V. M.: Purification, Annunciation, Assumption, Birth, Immaculate Conception;

(d) nineteen feasts of Saints: Mathias, Joseph, Philip and James, John the Baptist, Peter and Paul, James, Anna, Lawrence, Bartholomew, Matthew, Dedication of St. Michael, Simon and Jude, All Saints, Andrew, Thomas, Stephen, John, Holy Innocents, Sylvester.

(e) principal patron of nation and also principal patron of city or town, if it has one (Bargilliat, op. cit., 1106).

priest must celebrate the *Missa pro populo* according to the office of the day, even on the Sundays *to which* the solemnities of the Epiphany, Corpus Christi, SS. Peter and Paul, the principal patron of the place, and also other feasts *ex peculiaribus indultis* are transferred; nor does he satisfy the obligation *per Missam dictarum solemnitatum.*[10] Likewise in parochial churches in which there is but one priest (presumably prescinding from the privilege of bination and therefore *one Mass*), on *suppressed feasts* the Mass must be of the current day. It may not be the " missa cum cantu de requie in die et pro die obitus seu depositionis, physice vel moraliter praesente cadavere ".[11]

The bishop (or the pastor) must apply the Mass personally and on the days prescribed. If legitimately hindered, he shall apply it through someone else on these days. If this be impossible, he must apply it either personally or by proxy on another day as soon as possible. All omitted Masses must likewise be celebrated *quam primum.* To be legitimately hindered does not necessarily mean to be unable to *say* Mass at all, but only to *apply* the Mass. A pastor might, for example, have a Mass for a special intention, a funeral Mass, the Missa pro Sponso et Sponsa, or perhaps a large stipend for that day and for no other—all these and similar reasons are lawful, provided the other obligations of the canon are complied with.[12]

If a bishop have two or more dioceses, though they be *aeque principaliter* united (i. e. neither subordinate to the other), or if he have the administration of other dioceses besides his own, he fulfills his duty with one Mass for the entire flock (Can. 339 and 1419).

Prelati nullius, abbates nullius and vicars capitular have in this respect the same duty as residential bishops.

Apostolic administrators, such as are for special reasons appointed over a diocese, either permanently or temporarily, have the same obligations as the residential bishop or vicar capitular respectively. The temporary administrator need apply the *Missa pro populo* only while the diocese is actually vacant (Can. 312, 315).

[10] *A. A. S.*, Vol. III, p. 282.

[11] *A. A. S.*, Vol. II, p. 553.

[12] Chas. Augustine, O.S.B., *Commentary on New Code*, Vol. II, p. 363, on Can. 339.

Vicars and prefects apostolic, as well as all quasi-pastors under their authority (a quasi-pastor is one who rules a quasi-parish or territorial part of prefecture or vicariate apostolic, Can. 415, 216), must apply the *Missa pro populo* at least on the eleven solemn feasts of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, Immaculate Conception, and Assumption of B. V. M., St. Joseph, SS. Peter and Paul, and All Saints (Can. 306, 466).

A parish priest is obliged in the same manner as bishops (Can. 339), with this restriction that, even though he has a *just reason* to say the Mass on some *other day than that prescribed*, he needs the *permission of the Ordinary*. In addition he has the local obligation. In short, the parish priest is obliged to say only one Mass, even though he has two parishes under his charge. He must say it *personally*, unless legitimately hindered. A legitimate cause is sickness, some other personal duty, application of the Mass for his parents *in die obitus*, or the anniversary thereof. In such and similar cases he *may* apply it *per alium*, but *on the appointed day*. However, for a just reason the Ordinary may permit him to apply it on another day. The *Missa pro populo* is to be celebrated in the parish church unless circumstances ("rerum adjuncta") demand or persuade otherwise. Departure from the personal and local obligation does not demand the Ordinary's permission; but it is left to the prudent judgment of the pastor to determine whether these conditions or excusing circumstances are verified or not.[13] A justifying local circumstance would for example be the concourse of parishioners on a Sunday or feast at some noted chapel or shrine under the care of the parish priest.[14]

If the pastor is hindered legitimately from celebrating the Mass himself on the prescribed day he *must*, if possible, have it applied by a substitute on that day, and tender to him a stipend. If legitimately hindered from celebrating in the parochial church he may apply it *per se* where he stays or "per alium in loco proprio" (Can. 466, 339) at the pastor's expense, *ex justitia*.[15] The *Missa pro populo* is to be applied

[13] Augustine, op. cit., p. 551.

[14] Ferreris, *Institutiones Juris Canonicae*, Vol. I, p. 293.

[15] Goepfert refers to S. C. C., 4 September, 1896.

by the *pastor personally* because knowing and realizing the needs of his flock his prayers are apt to be more efficacious, and the secondary fruits of his Mass more abundant than those of a substitute. It is to be applied *in the parish church*, because the faithful being present at a Mass celebrated for their special benefit are likely to derive greater fruit from it than elsewhere. If one of the two conditions be impossible, the choice is left to the pastor's discretion.[16]

Parochial vicars, if appointed *pleno jure*, have all the rights and obligations of the pastor, hence also that of applying the *Missa pro populo*. Such by law are the perpetual vicars of moral-body-pastors (Can. 471); likewise the administrators of vacant parishes (Can. 473).

A canon-pastor, in case of concurrence of the conventual and the parochial Mass, must himself say the conventual Mass on the day prescribed, and the Mass for his parishioners *per alium* on the same day, or *per se* on another day (Can. 475, 476).

It may help to make the subject clearer if we here mention those *not bound* to apply the *Missa pro populo* by ecclesiastical law. These ecclesiastics are of three categories:

(1) Titular bishops. Of these the Canon says: "decet ex caritate" (Can. 348).

(2) For all Regular Superiors the obligation seems to remain "probabiliter debent ex precepto *divino* hypothetice saltem aliquoties," since they have also *external* jurisdiction, and therefore have a greater share of the pastoral office than the parish priest.[17] Superiors of religious congregations and pious institutes within the parish limits, and not exempt by law, but for some cause *exempted by the Ordinary from parochial jurisdiction* (Can. 464) would seem to be bound *in equity* to apply the *Missa pro populo*. One reason is that a pastor must apply the *Missa pro populis sibi commissis*; but religious and quasi-religious exempted from the parochial care cannot be said to belong to the "populus actualiter sibi commissus". Hence, if they are not to be deprived of the fruit of the Holy Sacrifice as contemplated by the Church, the *missa pro populo* must be supplied for them by the superior. As a

[16] Ferreris, l. c.

[17] Lehmkuhl, *Moral*, Vol. II, 196.

rule the constitutions of the respective institution make provision in this matter.

(3) Nor does the obligation of the *missa pro populo* fall upon parochial vicars having only subsidiary care of souls, namely the "vicarius adjutor" and the "vicarius cooperator". (The former is an assistant of a pastor who is permanently disabled from performing all the parochial functions properly; the latter is the ordinary assistant given to aid a pastor who has charge of so many souls that he alone cannot perform all the parochial duties.) To this group belongs also the temporary substitute, who takes the place of the pastor in all things pertaining to the "cura animarum," unless the pastor or Ordinary of the place make an exception (Can. 474). The Canon does not give the temporary substitute full rights and duties, at least not expressly; hence *per se* he need not assume the obligation of the *Missa pro populo*, unless the Ordinary or pastor so designate. If he assumes it, he is in justice entitled to a stipend from the pastor.[18] (The law gives two instances of temporary substitution, namely during a legitimate absence of the pastor, and during an impending ecclesiastical trial for crime, in which the accused appeals to Rome and is meanwhile deprived of the care of souls.)

What then is the conclusion to be drawn regarding the obligation of the *Missa pro populo* in the case of the American clergy? Is the American parish priest a canonical pastor? From the tenor of the entire legislation, we must infer the affirmative. Canon 216 rules that each diocese shall be divided into distinct territorial parts, each of which shall have its own church, to which the Catholic population of the district shall be assigned and over which a particular rector shall be placed as the proper pastor for the necessary care of souls. Any thus defined part of a diocese is a parish (Can. 216). A *parochus* is a priest or moral person upon whom is conferred a parish with the title of care of souls, to be exercised under the authority of the Ordinary (Can. 451).

From these clear-cut definitions, it follows that the essential features of a parish are contained in the fact that it comprises a locality with well-defined boundaries, a designated people,

[18] S. C. C., 4 September, 1869.

a particular church, and a proper pastor. Nor does the Code consider it essential that the pastor be irremovable, since it explicitly provides for the removal and change of so-called irremovables (Can. 2147, 2153, 2141).

Furthermore from a recent decision,[19] we learn that it is the teaching of the Roman Congregations that the obligation of the *Missa pro populo* rests entirely on the pastoral office, and not on the benefice or its returns. "Certum est hac lege obligari non solum parochos, sed etiam vicarios etsi curam actualem tantum exercentes, vel etiam *amovibiles ad nutum* aut ad breve tempus quamvis regularis sit paroecia aut parochus, *quamvis reditus nulli sint* aut admodum tenues ut ad congruam non sufficiant".[20] Whence the conclusion: "Unum igitur requiritur et sufficit ad hanc obligationem imponendam, hoc est quod sit *proprius pastor determinati gregis*, ita ut illi cura animarum commissa stricto sensu dici valeat."

In the light of these principles the S. Congregation of the Council places on record several decisions of *dubia* submitted to it for solution. In one of these there was question of so-called mission stations erected for the pastoration of Catholics dispersed among a much more numerous non-Catholic population, these stations having been assigned to individual curates who *by a decree* and *at the beck* of their Ordinary exercised *primary* care of souls. The question was whether these curates were bound to apply the *missa pro populo* in the mission stations mentioned. The answer, already discussed in the REVIEW, was that, since such stations are not parts of any apostolic prefecture or vicariate, but are definitely parts of a diocese, they are *true parishes* in as far as they represent a distinct territorial part, to which is assigned its own particular church, with a determinate people and their own particular rector as the proper pastor for the care of souls. The argument further states that the people of these stations can not be said to belong to some other neighboring parish, or to have another proper pastor besides the curate who acts as rector of the station. Nor can one object that such stations are not true parishes, because they are not erected into benefices, or that they have no definite

[19] *Acta Ap. Sed.*, Feb. 1919.

[20] Ben. XIV, *Cum semper oblatas*, §§ IV–V.

revenues, so long as they comprise a definite territory under definite pastoral care. The congregation of the council concludes that, since these stations must be considered true and proper parishes, there is no doubt that their rectors or curates are bound by the obligation of the *Missa pro populo,* as set forth in Canon 339.

The decision brings out the fact that Rome recognizes only two categories of territorial divisions, namely the parish and the quasi-parish. It argues that since these stations are not quasi-parishes, they must be parishes. The logical conclusion is that the American parishes, including stations separately cared for, are under the new Canon law regarded as true parishes. If the law makes the curates administering separate stations "proper pastors of a determinate congregation," it regards *a fortiori* the American parish priest as a canonical pastor.

ALBERT F. KAISER, C.PP.S.

Carthagena, Ohio.

PRACTICAL WAYS OF PROMOTING FREQUENT COMMUNION, PARTICULARLY AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE.

IN order to foster the practice of frequent Communion, the pastor of souls must first of all be convinced of its advisability, and then preach it. Here we have the principal means of bringing our people to the Holy Table *daily.* Is it then advisable to encourage the faithful to receive Holy Communion every morning?

One of the greatest of the many divine favors that we priests enjoy is the certitude we can secure in matters religious. We are not in the predicament of a Protestant minister. When a question of doctrine or discipline like the one under consideration arises, we can very soon learn the mind of the Church, and thus secure certitude. "He that heareth you, heareth me." "What you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven."

Now, what is the mind of our common mother—the Church? Does she wish us to preach frequent Communion? Are the faithful to be urged to receive our Lord daily?

The doctrine of the Church in this matter appears to be clear and decisive. It has been taught from the very beginning.

But especially during the past few years has the Church urged upon the faithful the salutary practice of frequent, yea, daily Holy Communion.

The clearest and most concise teachings of the Church concerning frequent Communion are to be found in *The Decrees of the Council of Trent, The Roman Catechism*, and in the decree *Sancta Tridentina Synodus*. From these official pronouncements we must conclude that frequent Communion has been imposed upon the faithful rather than proposed to them.

The following are the words of *The Roman Catechism*, which was published by the Holy See, for the use of parish priests: "Let the faithful not content themselves with receiving once a year, at Easter, the Body of the Lord, but let them know that they must receive the Eucharistic Communion oftener. As to the question whether Communion should be taken once a month or once a week, a certain and uniform rule cannot be given. Nevertheless the safest rule is that given by St. Augustine, 'Live in the manner that thou mayest communicate daily.' . . . This is why it will be the business of the parish priest [that is to say, of every priest who gives spiritual instruction and direction] to repeat often to the faithful that they must have a care to nourish and fortify their souls every day with this Sacrament. The priest shall *insist strongly*, in speaking of this subject, on the immense and divine advantages which we reap from Sacramental Communion. He should recall to mind the figure under which the Eucharist was foretold—the manna on which the children of Israel were to nourish themselves *daily* in order to sustain their bodily strength. And lastly, he must cite the authority of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, who so often enforce the frequent reception of this Sacrament. For it is not only St. Augustine who gives us this rule, 'You sin every day, then take the remedy every day'; but, whosoever will examine, will easily convince himself that such has been the doctrine of all the holy Fathers who have written on this subject." [1]

As early as 3 June, 1905, more than six months before the issue of the *Sancta Tridentina Synodus*, the late Sovereign Pontiff, Pius X, being, as is explicitly set forth, "most desirous

[1] *Cat. Rom.*, pars. II, cap. iv, no. 60.

that daily Communion, a practice so salutary and so pleasing to God, may by His grace be everywhere propagated among the faithful, granted indulgences for the recital of a prayer to the effect that those who are in the state of sanctifying grace may, when it is possible for them to do so, devoutly approach the Holy Table every day, so that *daily* receiving in Holy Communion the antidote to their *daily* venial sins, and *daily* nourishing in themselves the life of grace, they may at last attain to the life of bliss everlasting." [2] Then followed the decree *Sancta Tridentina Synodus* of 20 December, 1905, which is perhaps the most explicit of the many official documents on daily Communion; and later on, one on the *Confession of Daily Communicants*, issued 14 February, 1906.

All these pronouncements of the Holy See do nothing more than recall to mind and emphasize the doctrine and discipline of the primitive Church. It is clear, then, that we are expected to urge upon the faithful the propriety, advantages, and necessity of frequent Communion, and thus induce them to receive our Lord daily, if possible.

But how is this great change to be effected? It goes without saying that the transition from a yearly to a daily communicant must be gradual. Those who have been in the habit of receiving once a year might be urged to do so at least every three months; then monthly, and, later on, weekly. And if anyone acquires the habit of receiving weekly, it will not be long before he can be seen approaching the Holy Table daily.

The practice of frequent Communion is best introduced, no doubt, by removing false notions and prejudices concerning it. I dare say the most prevalent misconception that exists in the minds of the faithful is that Holy Communion is a reward of virtue rather than a remedy for spiritual maladies. This Sacrament is called by the Council of Trent a medicine for spiritual ills. The only spiritual ailment it is not meant to cure is mortal sin. And the only condition for its worthy reception is that the recipient be " free from mortal sin and have a right intention."

Many, too, do not receive frequently, from a false reverence toward the Eucharistic Saviour. To such the purpose of the

[2] *Daily Communion*, Lucas, S. J., p. 13.

Holy Eucharist as a *sacrament* must be made clear. From analogies it may be shown that our Lord often did things solely to win our confidence and affection. In fact it is seldom that He aimed at inspiring men with awe of His divine majesty. As at the Nativity, in the workshop of Nazareth, and in His Sacred Passion, so also in the Holy Eucharist reverence is not sought by Him *primarily*. He became a helpless babe, the "carpenter's son," the "man of reproach," the "outcast of his people," the "prisoner of the tabernacle," and "the spiritual manna," "propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem." In this Holy Sacrament He is the "Living Bread coming down from heaven," the "medicine of the soul," the "divine refreshment," the "meat unto life everlasting."

"There is no other ordinary way for any one, who is in the habit of committing mortal sin, to get rid of his passionate sinning, than frequent Communion." [3]

Many offer as an excuse that they are unable to find the time to go to confession so often, or to make due preparation and thanksgiving; or, again, where there is but one priest, and consequently only one Mass on weekdays, that they cannot avail themselves of the privilege of receiving our Lord daily. In some cases pastors might do well to distribute Holy Communion every morning at six, or half-past six o'clock, for the benefit of those who cannot come later. In any case it behoves us to know just what is required in the way of preparation and thanksgiving. "Whereas the Sacraments of the New Law," says the decree, "though they take effect *ex opere operato*, nevertheless produce greater effect in proportion as the dispositions are better, therefore care is to be taken that Holy Communion be preceded by serious preparation, and followed by a suitable thanksgiving, according to each one's strength, circumstances, and duties." [4] "Like the other Sacraments of Christ, the Eucharist fills the soul with grace and makes it strong, not in virtue of our personal pieties and efforts, but of its own inherent power and efficacy derived from our Lord—always supposing we put no positive hindrance to its working." [5]

[3] *Daily Communion*, Schlathoelter, p. 8.

[4] Decree on Daily Communion, 20 Dec., 1905.

[5] *Frequent and Daily Communion, Even for Men*, De Zulueta, S. J., p. 17.

Daily Communion does not, therefore, necessarily require a *long* preparation and thanksgiving. Nor does it involve daily Confession. "This becomes clear from the decree issued 14 February, 1906, by the Congregation of Indulgences, in which the Holy See confers a special privilege upon daily communicants, by which they may gain any plenary indulgence that occurs, even though they have not made the weekly Confession required in the case of others who may wish to gain several plenary indulgences under one and the same Confession. The same decree also provides that habitual daily communicants may still use this privilege, although they may have missed Communion 'once or twice' in the week. It should be noticed that in this pronouncement Rome leaves untouched the devotional question as to the desirability of confessing weekly. It says nothing for or against so salutary a practice, but is dealing solely with conditions for gaining indulgences. These it modifies in favor of the daily communicant, probably to meet his difficulty when hindered from getting to Confession."[6] In some cases it may be advisable to assure a penitent that not even "annual confession" is obligatory, except when one is conscious of grievous sin.

I will not enter upon the stock-in-trade objections made by the lukewarm and ill-instructed. Every pastor will hear of them and know how best to dispel them from the minds of his parishioners.

A Eucharistic Triduum every year, consisting of a series of instructions on the Holy Eucharist, followed by solemn Benediction, could be made very helpful. The book-rack, moreover, can be made a most efficacious means of promoting frequent Communion. The International Catholic Truth Society, as well as The Apostolic Mission House, of Washington, D. C., and the Mission Church Press, of Boston, Mass., have a number of excellent pamphlets on the subject. The Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament, New York City, likewise have several very good booklets on daily Communion. The reading at the Holy Hour can easily be made to serve the same end. Often no more helpful meditation can be selected for this devotion than a chapter or two from one of the many booklets on frequent

[6] *Frequent and Daily Communion*, Zulueta, S. J., pp. 16 and 17.

and daily Communion that have been published within the last four or five years.

The pastor who wishes to promote frequent Communion must, above all, be punctual. Father Lambing well says: "The unavoidable 'irregularity of missionary days' has given place, even in country districts, to a punctilious regularity in our day that makes the whole world move, as it were, by machinery, so that down to the minutest details of daily life five minutes one way or the other is something that has to be reckoned with. Hence persons who must follow their daily avocations and are at the same time anxious to hear Mass and receive Holy Communion frequently must calculate their time very closely. The person who has to take his train or car, to be at his shop, office, or store on time; the mother who must look after her family and household duties, must depend on the punctuality of the priest. . . . How many Holy Communions are lost because Father so-and-so was late. Parishioners will come to the church, wait for minutes, because minutes count with them, look impatiently at their watches, look at the altar, and not infrequently have to leave the church with a sad heart before Communion time, and, it may be, omit a Holy Communion, promised to the poor souls in petition for a needed favor, or in gratitude for a favor received through their assistance, and all this because 'Father was late, as usual.' From this is only one step, and a natural one, to staying away altogether, or coming without fasting." [7]

I venture to say that it will prove helpful to publish annually the number of Holy Communions distributed in one's church. We have no apprehension about the spiritual condition of a member who nourishes his soul often with the "Bread of the Strong." But we do have our misgivings about the man who partakes thereof only once or twice a year, and sometimes forgets about his Easter duty altogether A pastor should know, too, whether his parish as a society is a "frequent" or "infrequent" communicant; and it is well, I believe, for the parishioners to be told their status in this regard from time to time. This may be done on the occasion of the annual financial report. To a large number of parishioners, it will be of no less

[7] A. A. Lambing, ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, August, 1915, pp. 220-21.

interest to hear the exact number of Holy Communions distributed than to learn the *financial* condition of their parish.

In order that the non-communicants present at the week-day Mass be not obliged to remain in church longer than usual, it may be advisable to distribute Holy Communion before every Low Mass, and to begin early enough so that the Mass may not be delayed. The Sacred Congregation of Rites has answered in the negative the question whether it is forbidden to distribute Holy Communion immediately before or after Mass, when there is a good reason (*justa de causa*).[8] Recent and contemporary practice has interpreted as a " good reason " the convenience of the faithful, in matters temporal or spiritual, and no fault can, we think, be found with the practice, so long as there is no danger of departing from the spirit of the liturgy.

In the ever-increasing sacrifices involved in this matter, it is of importance to attend to details which might, at other times, seem trivial. Much time can be saved by instructing the faithful, once or twice a year, on the proper way to approach the Sacred Banquet. The faithful ought to be told to go as near the center of the communion-rail as possible, and, when receiving, to hold the head back, open the mouth wide, and allow the tip of the tongue to rest on the lower lip. Also, that an indulgence of five hundred days can be gained by looking upon the Consecrated Host and saying, mentally or orally, " My Lord and my God."

He who wishes the junior members of his parish to approach the Holy Table frequently would do well to explain the decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments on the First Communion of Children, at least once a year. As is well known, this decree, which was issued on 8 August, 1910, emphasizes the obligation of annual Confession and Communion " for everyone of the faithful of both sexes from the time they attain the years of discretion ".

The pastor who conforms to the regulations of the Church as expressed in this decree will not have much difficulty in promoting frequent Communion. Those who are led to this " most sweet feast " at the tender age of seven years need not be urged to return. If instructed properly, they will in a short time become frequent communicants.

[8] Decree, No. 3852, ad. 3um.

If we wish to develop a relish for Holy Communion in the faithful, we must, above all, urge the children to receive frequently. This can be done efficaciously at Sunday school and Sodality meetings. Boys and girls should, I think, be exhorted often to attend Sunday school as long as possible. In a well organized parish the senior members of the Sunday-school class will have been going to Holy Communion for the past seven or eight years. These need thorough instruction, lest the practice of receiving frequently become a matter of mere "routine". It is at the tender age at which children are now admitted to their First Holy Communion that a taste and relish for the Bread of Angels is easily imparted. And once the little ones taste spiritual sweetness at its very source, they will return to the Communion rail as readily as bees to a bed of flowers. Thorough instruction, given often and regularly, will preserve them against tedium or routine. If, in appointing servers for the children's Mass, preference is given to boys who are daily communicants, their example will exert a salutary influence on their fellow pupils. This should not be done, however, in a way to make it appear that their privilege is meant to be a reward for good behavior.

The Sodality of the Blessed Virgin is the best means of promoting frequent Communion among those who no longer attend Sunday school. It goes without saying, however, that the meetings should be held regularly at least once a month, and that a well prepared instruction should be given at each one of the twelve meetings. The particular needs of the young people of the parish will suggest the manner of presenting the remedy offered by the Physician of Souls, our Eucharistic Saviour. "It is an enormous gain that, during the most critical and formative years of young people, when their passions are awaking, the seeds of future good or evil being sown in their young souls, habits being formed that will remain with them for weal or woe, perhaps even to their dying day, they can be fortified and moulded, so to speak, by the daily or frequent reception of their Lord and God." [9]

Young people ought to be told again and again that it is "the desire of Jesus Christ and of the Church that all of them

[9] *Frequent and Daily Communion*, McDonnell, S. J., p. 45.

should daily approach the Sacred Banquet, in order that, becoming united with God by means of the Sacrament, they may thence derive strength to resist their sensual passions, cleanse themselves from the stains of daily faults, and avoid those graver sins to which human frailty is liable." [10] Also "that they have in Holy Communion the very best means of overcoming temptation and avoiding sin; for the Council of Trent calls the Holy Eucharist the antidote whereby we are delivered from daily faults and preserved from deadly sins." [11]

In assigning the Communion Sunday it may be well to have the boys of the parish approach the Holy Table on the same day the men do; the girls and women on some other Sunday; likewise, the Young Men's and the Young Ladies' Sodalities could be given one and the same Sunday. Thus the different classes of the parish would eventually become a mutual incentive to one another in the matter of frequent Communion.

Opportunity, too, should be given all, and especially the young, to go to confession before every weekday Mass, as well as on the eve of holidays, the first Fridays, etc. A difficulty seems to present itself with regard to the required advice of the confessor. If the famous decree under consideration gives the privilege of daily Communion to all—young and old of every condition of life—if only they be free from mortal sin and have a right intention, why does it bid (*oportet*) all to seek the advice of a confessor?

"To this question it may be answered, in accordance with the teaching of distinguished writers on the subject: (1) that to ask the advice of one's confessor is plainly an act of salutary humility; (2) that it is a precautionary measure, lest the penitent should deceive himself, either as to the state of his conscience or as to the rectitude of his intention; and (3) that an opportunity is thereby afforded to the confessor of helpful counsel, as to the manner in which the penitent may turn this great gift to the best advantage. . . . But it is further to be observed that, while the penitent is recommended, though not commanded, to seek the advice of a confessor on the subject of the daily Communion, the confessor on his side is by no

[10] St. Augustine.

[11] Sess. XIII, cap. ii.

means left without very plain and explicit directions as to the course which he is to pursue. For, in the first place, he is 'to dissuade no one' (*ne quemquam avertat*) from daily Communion, provided only that the penitent has the requisite qualifications, which are the state of grace and a right intention. He may, indeed, often have occasion to dissuade his penitent from this or that venial fault, as little in keeping with the practice of daily Communion; but it would be obviously an inversion of the right order of things to hinder him from daily Communion on the ground that this holy practice is out of keeping with his faults; always, of course, on the assumption that he has at least the intention to profit by daily Communion, as a preservative against mortal sin." [12]

"We do not know the value of souls, nor do we have any idea of the wonderful beauty of a soul that is free from mortal sin. God knows all that, hence His 'delight to be with the children of men'. The greatest advantage we have from frequent Communion consists in this, that our Lord, through our eating His flesh and drinking His blood, abides in us and we in Him." [13]

A serious difficulty still remains, however, at least for the pastor who is unable to obtain sufficient, or efficient, assistance. On the one hand, his pastoral work is often already very heavy and complicated; on the other hand, the carrying out of the rules laid down by the supreme director of Catholic consciences in the recent decrees on Holy Communion entails ever greater sacrifices of time and labor. We can but do our best, and leave the rest to God. "Ad impossibile nemo tenetur." However, we are supposed by virtue of our office to be ready to give our life for our sheep. The task assigned every priest when appointed to the cure and care of souls is virtually without limit. So, in its final analysis the question resolves itself into doing this or that, one thing or another of many, all of which are inseparable from a priest's duties. A pastor's work is never completely done till he draws his last breath. It is hard to conceive how anyone could sacrifice himself more fittingly than in a last effort to bring Jesus Christ into the hearts of

[12] *Daily Communion*, Lucas, S. J., pp. 14 and 15.
[13] *Daily Communion*, Schlathoelter, p. 24.

those confided to him. If we bear in mind that it is the most cherished wish of our Lord Himself that we do all in our power to induce the faithful to receive Him daily, the burden will be light and sweet, even though it send us to our grave prematurely.

These few ways and means have proved very helpful in promoting the practice which the great Pius X emphasized as "salutary and agreeable to God." The sublime aim of His pontificate was "to restore all things in Christ," the means he chose to realize this ideal was the universal introduction of frequent Communion. Our aim and means are the same with regard to our parishes. If the souls confided to us were taught and trained to communicate spiritually or actually every day, "the restoration in Christ" would follow quite naturally.

"Frequent Communion," said that illustrious Pontiff in a brief of 14 July, 1907, "is, in truth, the shortest way to secure the salvation of every individual man as well as that of society. Without this food the soul cannot live, as our Lord says, 'just as the body cannot live without food'."

"There is so much said and done nowadays concerning social politics. All endeavor to do something for the betterment of society. Men hold meetings and write long articles about this and that way to further the happiness of the human family. The great Pius X has solved the problem of social politics. 'The shortest and surest way is frequent Communion.'" [14] Its benefits are without end and measure to the individual and to human society.

And if all Christians were to conform to this ardent desire of Christ and the Church regarding frequent Communion, that peace which is so sadly wanting would soon return. Whenever we proceed to give Holy Communion we pray for this inexpressible favor, "Ecce Agnus Dei etc . . . dona nobis pacem." The Prince of Peace entering the heart of the communicant brings that peace which surpasseth all understanding; by the individual this blessed good is brought daily into the home; the home diffuses it throughout the community.

We are, then, by divine grace the custodians and dispensers of that for which the entire world is yearning. Ours is the

[14] *Daily Communion*, Schlathoelter, p. 26.

grave duty and blessed privilege of gaining and establishing peace, by leading men to the "waters of eternal life". Here they shall be cleansed, sanctified, rejoiced, and borne along toward that mystical river "seen and sung by the royal psalmist, which rejoiceth the city of God," and whose blessed waters shall be the delight of the elect unto endless ages.

FREDERICK A. HOUCK.

Toledo, Ohio.

THE LONELINESS OF THE PRIEST.

"Mortal, love that Holy One or dwell for aye alone."

GOD created man first. "And the Lord took man and put him into a paradise of pleasure to dress it and to keep it." Afterward God created a companion for man—the first woman. "And the Lord said: It is not good for man to be alone; let us make him a help like unto himself." Woman is man's natural companion. Without her companionship man is, humanly speaking, lonely. Although single life is above nature, the Apostle recommends it for certain persons. "He that can take, let him take it. All men take not the word, but they to whom it is given."

We priests have sacrificed the privilege of an ideal woman's companionship for life. This does not mean, however, that the natural man in us has ceased to long for his natural environment. It is a sacrifice to forgo that for which nature makes so strong a plea. Deprived of the privilege of enjoying the companionship God prepared for man, priests are, humanly speaking, a class of lonely men.

It is interesting, therefore, to observe how priests deal with the problem of loneliness, and what means they employ to overcome it. Some make light of the warning that "it is not good for man to be alone". Others lead a life of study. Some indulge in lawful pleasures. They have cozy rooms, they procure the best in the way of food and drink and tobacco. They spend a great deal of time outdoors or in society. They go to places of amusement; they travel; in a word, they see to it that single life does not become dull. They seem to think that they will not miss so much the one thing they may not have if they

satisfy the lawful desires of nature in other respects. Still others lead a very active life. They try to make themselves believe that they are too busy to be lonely. Some again, take up a hobby, whilst others become "woman haters". Some hope to stifle the longing for the companionship under consideration by leading a very spiritual life. And others console themselves with the thought that an ideal companion for life is rare indeed; that voluntary single life has prevented a probable misstep on their part. "Who shall find a valiant woman? Far and from the uttermost coasts is the price of her." Some do not realize that loneliness is a problem. The words of Scripture apply to them: "There is but one, he hath not a second, no child, no brother, and yet he ceaseth not to labor, neither are his eyes satisfied with riches, neither doth he reflect, saying: For whom do I labor and defraud my soul of good things?"

Now it ought to be evident that the various ways I have just enumerated, and the many more I might mention, of dealing with the problem of loneliness, are inadequate. If a natural craving cannot be stifled, the only logical and effective way of dealing with it is either to yield to its demands, or, if that cannot be done, to satisfy the desire by offering it the equivalent or something better than the equivalent of what it calls for.

The Church realizes this. She knows that "it is not good for man to be alone." Hence, she does not say to us on the day of our renunciation: "Ridicule the problem of loneliness; enjoy lawful pleasures; study; keep busy; take up a hobby; shun women; stifle the craving for companionship; be glad that you have been called to lead a single life; do this and you will not be lonely." The Church knows that these suggestions will no more cure loneliness than the advice to "forget it" will heal a wound caused by some great sorrow.

The Church, I repeat it, does not try to evade the serious problem of loneliness. Hence she says to us, as it were, on the day we promise to lead a single life: "I know you are human; I realize that your life without a companion would be a lonely one indeed. I have not overlooked the warning: 'It is not good for man to be alone.' You must and you shall have an ideal companion. There," she says, pointing to the tabernacle, "there dwells your Companion for life. Listen," she continues,

" to these words, addressed by Christ, to one of His loyal priests. He meant them for you as well: ' If all creatures that are or ever have been, loved thee passionately, know that they could not love thee with a spark of that love wherewith I love thee, nor could they help thee in the slightest thing as I can help thee. All that they could do for thee would be as cruelty compared with My kindness, and as hatred compared with My love. Nothing can be compared with My sweet and holy familiarity with thee, especially when thou holdest Me in thy hands. Why, then, dost thou strike at shadows? Why dost thou not trust Me only, who, of My mercy, give Myself to thee to hold and receive into thy heart? What better friend canst thou have than Me? Seek not remedies that are human, for knowest thou not that cursed is the man that trusteth in man. Place all thy hopes in Me, because if thou hast Me thou hast everything.' "

This is all excellent theory, some will be tempted to think. But will the Blessed Sacrament supply and more than supply what Daniel O'Connell called the " purest happiness that man ever enjoyed "? Speaking of his companion, he declared: " She gave me thirty-four years of the purest happiness that man ever enjoyed." To be candid, many of us do not know what to do with ourselves when on our knees before the Altar. Suppose we did force ourselves to spend a great deal of time in church, what would our fellow-priests think of us? Would we not become conspicuous?

Yes, the Blessed Sacrament does supply, and more than supply, merely human companionship. All the saints, if asked, would declare: " He (the Sacramental Saviour) gave me twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty years of the purest happiness that man ever enjoyed." Long visits with Christ in the Blessed Sacrament would naturally be tedious to beginners, and they would make them conspicuous; but who expects beginners to keep company with the Sacramental Saviour by the hour? No one, not Christ, nor the Church, nor reasonable men.

What Christ does expect is that we appreciate the fact that we belong to the one hundred and forty thousand spoken of in Scripture " who were purchased from the earth ". " These are they who were not defiled with women, for they are virgins. These follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. These were

purchased from among men, the first fruits to God and the Lamb." What Christ does expect is that we never envy those of whom St. Paul says: "But he that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and he is divided." What Christ does expect is that we say Holy Mass and receive Holy Communion with all possible attention and devotion. He expects us to appreciate the privilege of living under one roof with Him. He expects us to make the prescribed visits to the Blessed Sacrament in the course of the day. He expects us to come to Him in the hour of trial, mindful of His invitation: "Come to Me all you that labor and are burdened and I will refresh you." Surely this is not asking too much. This is the way the saints began.

And if we are loyal to Christ by doing what I have just enumerated, the desire will gradually arise in us to do more. And when that time comes, Christ will expect us to do more. He will expect us to assist at Holy Mass as often as we can. He will expect us to be present, if possible, at the devotions held in church for the people. And when we must say our office indoors, He will expect us to do so in His presence. In this way we will spend a great deal of time with Christ; we will not be at a loss what to say, and we will not be conspicuous.

If, in the course of time, we feel ourselves drawn to the foot of the Altar, like the saints, Christ will of course expect us to act like saints. If that day ever comes, we will find the company of our Sacramental Lover fascinating beyond words, and our devotion and love to the Blessed Sacrament will be an inspiration to both the clergy and laity.

Speaking of Christ, one who found Him at last wrote:

> Let me tell you how I made His acquaintance:
> I had heard much of Him, but took no heed.
> He sent daily gifts and presents, but I never thanked Him.
> He often seemed to want my friendship, but I remained cold.
> I was homeless, and wretched, and starving, and in peril every hour; and He offered me shelter and comfort and food and safety; but I was ungrateful still.
> At last He crossed my path and with tears in His eyes He besought me saying, Come and abide with Me.

Let me tell you how He treats me now.
He supplies all my wants.
He gives me more than I dare ask.
He anticipates my every need.
He begs me to ask for more.
He never reminds me of my past ingratitude.
He never rebukes me for my past follies.

Let me tell you further what I think of Him.
He is as good as He is great.
His love is as ardent as it is true.
He is as lavish of His promises as He is faithful in keeping them.
He is as jealous of my love as He is deserving of it.
I am in all things His debtor, but He bids me call Him Friend.

Father Talbot Smith gives us the following description, which he seems to think applies to not a few of our young American priests:

Mix up the following ingredients: a young man of twenty-three, bred in the Catholic college and seminary, nervously pretty well strained between fixed routine and American hurry, the routine of parish life and pulpit, confessional, sick-calls, admirers in the congregation, observers and critics in the rectory, freedom which he enjoys but does not understand, indifference to rest and exercise, reserve strength misused in much visiting, little criticism and no guidance, perhaps resentment against both, eagerness for pleasures so long denied him by regulation, transient indifference to reading, study and old habits.

Now what is going to happen to such a young man if there is no one to inspire him with an exalted opinion of his wonderful calling, if there is no one to help him realize that "it is not good for man to be alone," if there is no one to bring home to him, by word and example, the place the Blessed Sacrament ought to occupy in the life of every priest? What is going to keep him from becoming a prey to the many dangers which will beset his path for the first ten years of his priestly life? A miracle?

They tell the following story of a little child: Her mother had put her to bed and given her a doll to play with. The child was contented for a while. But after some time she became restless and began to cry. "What is the matter, Helen?" the

mother asked. "I am tired," she answered, "of staying up here with nobody but God and my dolly. I want somebody with skin on."

If the Blessed Sacrament means to the young priest only as much as the lifeless doll meant to this little girl when she began to cry, it ought not surprise us to see him gradually turn to someone "with skin on" for companionship. If a priest is allowed to go out into the world without having his attention called to the problem of loneliness and its only cure, we ought, it seems to me, not be surprised when we hear of his downfall. Loneliness has been the beginning of the downfall of many a priest, destined, under proper training, to have become as great a devotee of the Blessed Sacrament as any of the saints.

The cure for unfortunate priests, I mean the genuine, lasting cure, is not a Trappist Monastery, though in some cases it may be a necessary one; the cure is not new enactments on the part of a General Council; the cure is not a religious persecution; the cure is companionship with Christ in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. As Benson put it: "We do not rise to our full spiritual stature by eradicating passions. The ideal man is not a passionless man. He is rather one whose passions are turned into the right channel. The ideally pure man is not the sexless man; he is the man who loves violently what he ought, as he ought."

Who is the object, I ask, of a priest's love? Christ. And where will he find Him? In the Blessed Sacrament. Chesterton brings out the same truth in fewer words: "Chastity," he writes, "does not mean abstention from sexual wrong; it means something flaming, like Joan of Arc."

What a satisfaction to see a victim of loneliness return to the foot of the Altar and to hear him exclaim, as it were: "Indeed the Lord is in this place and I knew it not. How terrible is this place; this is no other than the House of God and the Gate of Heaven. One thing I have asked of the Lord, this will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, that I may see the delight of the Lord and may visit His temple. For better is one day in Thy courts above thousands. I have chosen to be an abject in the house of my God, rather than dwell in the tabernacles of sinners. This is my rest forever and ever; here will I dwell, for I have chosen it."

A fellow priest once said to me in the course of a discussion on the problem of loneliness: "Take the case of Fathers — and —. They were brought over from the old country when they were mere boys. They spent the many years of preparation for the priesthood in college and in seminary. They never associated with any one except their fellow-students. I was not unduly surprised, therefore, when I saw them go out to creatures after they entered upon their public career. But I am surprised at my own case. I was born in this country. I spent many vacations at home. I realized sufficiently what I was sacrificing when I accepted Christ as my portion. I have been in the ministry many years. I am forty-five years of age. Yet the feeling of loneliness comes over me whenever I am in the company of men and women of the world. To console myself I keep repeating, 'Vanity of vanities'."

How much more happy the life of this loyal priest would have been had he been taught, when attracted by created beauty, to think of the infinite Beauty of Him whom he had chosen as his Portion, had he been taught to turn to Christ and to exclaim at the sight of the best the world has to offer:

> But, O, what hast thou won?
> A Lover that is ever pure,
> And love that shall aye endure,
> When the sands of life are run.
> Then, mourner, from the death arise;
> Thine are no fragile earth-born ties,
> Which part and sever,
> But love Divine, which never dies,
> Is thine forever.

The loyal lover of Christ is never lonely. He can go to Christ at any time. He lives under the same roof with Him, and when he leaves home he does so only to serve Christ and his fellow-men; he leaves Christ for Christ's sake. When about to undertake a journey he feels like Joyce Kilmer, when he wrote:

> I take my leave with sorrow of Him I love so well.
> I look my last upon His small and radiant prison cell.
> O happy lamp! to serve Him with never-ceasing light;
> O happy flame! to tremble forever in His sight.
>
> I leave the holy quiet for the lonely human train
> And my heart that He has breathed upon is filled with lonely pain.
> O King, O Friend, O Lover! what sorer grief can be,
> In all the reddest depths of hell, than banishment from Thee?

But from my windows, as I speed across the sleeping land,
I see the towns and villages wherein His houses stand.
Above the roofs I see a Cross outlined against the night,
And I know that there my Lover dwells in His Sacramental might.

Dominions kneel before Him, and Powers kiss His feet.
Yet for me He keeps His weary watch in the turmoil of the street.
The King of Kings awaits me wherever I may go,
O who am I that He should deign to love and serve me so?

The loyal lover of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament will never be lonely in his old age, that period of life of which we read in *The Blindness of Doctor Gray*: "The strongest of us will cling to some support in our darkness and descent to the grave." The company of Christ will then be his one great comfort and support.

The loyal lover of Christ will not be lonely in the hour of death. After receiving Viaticum, he will, if necessary, gladly dismiss his attendants, with the words of Cardinal Newman: "I can meet my God alone."

And as the loyal lover of Christ leaves earth he will not have to say farewell to his companion, for he knows that he shall find Him awaiting his arrival on the threshold of eternity. "Arise," Christ will say to him, "make haste my love, my beautiful one and come, for the winter is now past, the rain over and gone; arise, my love, my beautiful one, and come."

The only kind of loneliness Christ will tolerate in a loyal lover, the only kind of loneliness a loyal lover will ever experience, is that which the Psalmist experienced when he cried out: "As the heart panteth after the fountains of water, so my soul panteth after Thee, O God. My soul hath thirsted after the strong living God; when shall I come and appear before the face of God? My tears have been my bread day and night, whilst it is said to me daily: where is thy God?"

Our meditation would be incomplete without one word on the ideal method of dealing with women. Our work brings us into touch with the world's best women. Their spiritual interests have been placed in our hands by Christ himself.

To put it briefly, the ideal way of dealing with women is to be businesslike in our relations with them. We must act like a business man of whom women say: "His heart is at home. In his dealings with us he is businesslike, and withal most courteous, obliging and kind; in a word, he is a perfect gentleman."

Women must see that we are interested in their welfare and not in them. We cannot deceive women in this respect. "Can a man hide fire in his bosom and his garments not burn?"

We must act like men who have found all and more than the human heart can contain; not like men who are seeking, not like those who are lonely and restless and discontented. How much time we would save and how much good we could do for women if we acted in the manner just described. I dare say, nothing disappoints a woman of intelligence and refinement, a truly spiritual woman, more than a priest who forgets the Infinite One and betrays indications of turning to her.

In *Callista* the heroine says of Agellius: "Here is a man who so far from feeling himself blest, thinks I can bless him, comes to me—me, Callista, an herb of the field, poor weed, exposed to every wind of heaven and shriveling before the fierce sun—to me he comes to rest his heart upon. . . . Oh my disappointment, when first I saw in you indications that you were thinking of me only as others think and felt toward me, as others may feel; that you were aiming at me, not at your God; that you had much to tell of yourself, but nothing of Him. Time was I might have been led to worship you, Agellius. You have hindered it by worshiping me."

All this sounds very simple. But let us remember that what a certain author says is only too true: "In the process of making a gentleman (and let me add, in the process of making an ideal ambassador of Christ), the last flaw that is ground out is a tendency toward familiarity."

An ideal priest is, of course, a puzzle to the natural man. He sees that he has no visible companion like the rest of men; he cannot see and knows nothing of the Invisible One to whom he has sworn loyalty. "But the sensual man perceiveth not these things that are of the spirit of God, for it is foolishness to him and he cannot understand, because it is spiritually examined."

Still, deep down in their hearts men cannot but admire what they know to be a reality, even if they cannot understand it. An ideal Catholic priest is the greatest center of attraction in any community. A discontented priest does a great deal of harm. He gives non-Catholics and Catholics an opportunity of saying what I once heard a distinguished Catholic layman

remark, who had had unpleasant experiences with several "cranky" priests: "I wonder if their lonely life accounts for the fact that they are so irritable?"

Let us thank God for our sublime calling. Let us not try to stifle the desire for companionship in the futile ways I enumerated. Let us satisfy it by keeping company with Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament. Let us look to the beauty and cleanliness of the church, because the church is the house of God and our home. Let us spend as much time as possible in the company of Jesus Christ, present in the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. Familiarity with the Sacramental Saviour will not breed contempt. The more we associate with Him the more we will enjoy His company, and the less will we be tempted to envy the lot of those living in the best of homes. Let us often repeat the words Christ loves to hear from the lips of His anointed: "What have I in heaven, and besides Thee what do I desire upon earth. For Thee my flesh and heart hath fainted away; thou art the God of my heart and the God that is my portion forever."

And whenever we, who have pledged ourselves to lead a single life, are tempted to overrate the sacrifice we have made, let us recall the truth which Aubrey de Vere brings out in his famous verses:

Love thy God and love Him only
And thy breast will never be lonely.
In that one great Spirit meet
All things mighty, grave and sweet.

Vainly strives the soul to mingle
With a being of our kind,
Vainly hearts with hearts are twined;
For the deepest still is single.

An impalpable resistance
Holds like natures still at distance.
Mortal, love that Holy One,
Or dwell for aye alone.

FR. ANGELO, O.F.M.

Portland, Oregon.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL OUTLOOK IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA, the new ship of State, is hardly off the ways. The United States, France, and England, have, it is true, conceded the right of political self-determination to the ethnologically related group of peoples inhabiting Bohemia, Moravia, Slovakia, and a part of Silesia. A republican form of government has been set up at Prague, the ancient capital of Bohemia. In France and in Italy the Czechoslovak fought with valor, and nothing short of strategic genius will explain the Czechoslovak Anabasis in Siberia, where the youthful General Gaida, with inadequate supplies and only forty thousand men, held a battle line of two thousand miles against overwhelming odds. All this promises well for Czechoslovakia. Nevertheless the new Slav republic is face to face with difficulties that will test its political mettle to the utmost. More blood will have to be shed before Hungary relinquishes its hold on Slovakia, whose southern boundary is uncomfortably close to Budapest. Even when the boundaries shall have been established, the Czechoslovak must build up his commercial and economic life almost surrounded by enemies.

Formidable as these external difficulties may appear, they dwindle into insignificance by the side of the dangers that threaten from within. Among the internal problems waiting an early solution the religious question looms up as of first importance. The Czechoslovaks are Catholics. The number of Protestants and other religious bodies is a negligible quantity. In Bohemia, however, and parts of Moravia there is a considerable number of fallen-away Catholics who style themselves free-thinkers and who will go out of their way to show their hostility to the Church. The men holding important position in the Czechoslovak government to-day, are men of this type. It is not hard to foresee what will be the religious attitude of the small but powerful minority which rules the country. The separation of Church and State is a certainty. How will this separation affect the Church? Undoubtedly, much depends on the manner in which the separation is effected.

If Bohemia alone were concerned, it is not only possible but probable that the separation of the Church would be brought about in the French, if not in the Mexican fashion, by confiscation of all Church property and by persecution. The

Bohemians are highly intelligent, emotional, and endowed with fine imagination. As long as they hold to the Church of their fathers they are model Catholics. The faith of the rural districts in Bohemia is the faith of the rural districts in Ireland. But in accord with the ancient adage "corruptio optimi pessima," it would be difficult to find a people that treats holy things as lightmindedly or stoops so low to show disrespect to everything Catholic as the fallen-away Bohemian. With such men at the helm, religious persecution would necessarily be the order of the day. Fortunately, as we leave Bohemia and go south-east, we enter Moravia where, outside the industrial centers, which are permeated with socialism, the faith planted by SS. Cyril and Methodius still bears abundant fruit. In Slovakia we find Catholic life at its best. The Slovak language might be called the Doric dialect of the Bohemian. It is vigorous and racy, and the Slovak faith, like the vowels of his language, have not suffered from attenuation. The Slovak is a born orator, well able to take care of his rights. The first resolution anent the settlement of the religious question was a Slovak resolution asking the Prague government to allow Slovakia to settle the matter in her own way.

As affairs stand to-day, the immediate outlook for the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia is anything but hopeful. It is true that Masaryk is but mildly anti-Catholic, and that he desires to enter into diplomatic relations with the Holy See. He encourages American priests to explain the status of the Catholic Church in America and he has expressed a determination to make the United States his model in adjusting religious matters. Unfortunately Mr. Masaryk is not a strong man. He betrayed his weakness in the last elections in which he made little or no effort to save the coalition government, and the frequent acts of hoodlumism occurring at Prague are hardly consistent with a strong rule. When V. Tusar, former editor of the Socialist paper *Rovnost* (Equality), was entrusted with the task of forming the new cabinet, it was to be expected that the Catholics would not be represented in the government. The political and religious complexion of the present cabinet will hardly please Moravia and Slovakia; neither will it strengthen the credit of Czechoslovakia. Mr. Masaryk has declared the union of Church and State a relic of Hapsburg misgovernment. But it must be observed that if the State withdraws all benefices

from the clergy, most of the priests will be left without support of any kind. The change must be gradual or it will be disastrous. Conditions in the new republic are not parallel to those in the United States.

When we glance at the condition of the Church itself, the prospect in Czechoslovakia is scarcely more encouraging. The Archbishop of Prague is in Switzerland and the present government is sure to demand the removal of bishops who were suspected of any sympathy with the Hapsburg cause. But the strangest anomaly of the situation is the " Union " of the clergy which met at Prague on the 2 November, ten days after the establishment of the new republic. It was claimed that its membership constitutes seventy-five per cent of the clergy who minister to ninety per cent of the people.

All the clergy were to belong to one Union, but divergent views among them made disintegration inevitable. Very soon there were one Bohemian, two Moravian, and one Slovak Union in existence. The Rev. P. Kroiher, one of the leaders, in announcing the program of the Union, stated that the clergy would, as a matter of course, remain faithful to the Church. He pointed with satisfaction to the inestimable benefit of being no longer the servant of the State. Only the most radical element of the Union has asked for " reforms " which have astonished the Catholic world and which received prominent notice in the secular papers: Church autonomy, use of the vernacular in the liturgy, optional celibacy, cremation, changes in the Breviary (?), revision of the rules and statutes of the religious orders. The hierarchy and the religious stand aloof from the movement, a Premonstratensian abbot being the isolated exception among the latter. Strange to say, Baar, Kroiher, Zahradnik, Dostal, Dvorak, the leaders of the reform including a demand for optional celibacy and other radical changes, are not young priests, but men who have already seen Abraham or are about to make that interesting experience. When Monsignor Valfre da Bonzo of Vienna was questioned regarding the probable attitude of the Holy See toward these reforms, the Nuncio conceded the possibility of many of the reforms, but added an emphatic " Never " to the question of celibacy. The radicals boast that even the word " never " has not frightened them from the attempt. The petition of thirty thousand women against clerical celibacy has little significance for anyone who

knows how petitions of this kind are managed. The plea "that the marriage of the priests would show reverence for the sacrament of matrimony" lets the proverbial cat out of the bag.

The Priests' Union is not a novelty in Bohemia. A similar union was formed fourteen years ago, only to be suppressed by the bishops. The cause of the malady is an old one and there is a number of satisfactory explanations at hand. Josephinism, which in Austria was not dead but sleeping, would of itself throw much light on the situation.

Despite the obstacles which the Church in Czechoslovakia must surmount, we may nevertheless view the future, if not with confidence, at least without alarm. The new State is only learning its alphabet of republican government. When the people are once fairly represented, they will be represented by men who will safeguard the civil and religious liberty of all men. The war has made men bold and the free-thinkers of Bohemia will not be able to duplicate the feat of the Masons in France. The clergy, no longer dependent on "the favor of princes", will live closer to their people. There are enough excellent and model men among the clergy of Czechoslovakia to enable us to discount the dangers of the Union. Extravagant demands, the proposal of which was left unopposed amidst the general excitement of the troubled times, will not be countenanced when men's minds have returned to the normal groove. If on the one hand we see a few free-thinkers pull down an ancient statue of the Blessed Virgin in the City of Prague, we are immediately consoled upon learning how from forty to sixty thousand people of all ranks gathered upon short notice to make a reparation to the Mother of God and to consecrate anew to the Queen of Heaven a country whose landscapes are dotted with shrines which living faith has built in her honor. There is but one great menace to the Church in Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia: it is Bolshevism which threatens to disorganize all government and destroy Christian civilization.

When, however, men have tried out their Godless theories, when they shall have seen the chaos brought about by unsupported human wisdom, may we not hope that groping in the midst of disorder, misery and crime, humanity may hearken to the voice of God's saving Church?

BEDE HORSA, O.S.B.

St. Benedict, La.

AFFINITY AND THE NEW CODE.

THE Church has frequently changed her discipline with regard to affinity, and the drastic changes on the subject which have been inserted into the new Code of Canon Law are a good example of the fearlessness with which the Church uses her authority when changed circumstances seem to require it. The ecclesiastical law now in force on the subject is stated in the new Code in a few, simple but far-reaching canons.

CANON 97.

§ 1. Affinity arises from valid marriage whether ratified only or ratified and consummated.

§ 2. It exists only between the man and the relations by blood of the woman, and also between the woman and the relations by blood of the man.

§ 3. It is so reckoned that those who are the relations by blood of the man are the relations by marriage of the woman in the same line and degree, and *vice versa*.

CANON 1077.

§ 1. Affinity in the direct line annuls marriage in every degree; it annuls it in the collateral line to the second degree inclusively.

§ 2. The impediment of affinity is multiplied:

1°. As often as the impediment of consanguinity is multiplied from which it proceeds;

2°. By the successive repetition of marriage with a relation of a dead spouse.

The first section of Canon 97 changes the very notion of affinity as it has been understood in ecclesiastical law from very early times. Practically it adopts the definition of affinity which was accepted in Roman Law and which has been followed by most modern legal systems. Affinity therefore, now, in ecclesiastical law arises only from ratified Christian marriage. It does not arise from the marriage of unbaptized persons, and probably not even from the marriage of a baptized person with another not baptized. It does not arise from carnal intercourse, whether licit between married people, or illicit between those who are not married. This simple change sweeps away some very irksome difficulties which frequently occurred under the old ecclesiastical legislation. According to the law as it existed before the new Code came into force,

and which still governs cases which happened before that date, affinity arose only from carnal intercourse. It annulled marriage to the fourth degree when it arose from lawful carnal intercourse, and to the second degree when it arose from unlawful intercourse. Theologians taught, and the doctrine was confirmed by many decisions of the Roman Congregations, that although the diriment impediment of affinity did not affect unbaptized persons, yet carnal intercourse between unbaptized persons produced a natural bond which became the diriment impediment of affinity after the reception of baptism. Moreover, if a married man committed adultery with a near relative of his wife, he thereby contracted affinity with his wife which deprived him of his marital rights until dispensed by lawful authority. All these difficulties are now swept away and ecclesiastical law on the subject of affinity has been brought into greater harmony with the civil law of the country.

These great and beneficial changes in the law of the Church have their counterpart in the past history of this diriment impediment of marriage.

Natural feeling and the necessary intimacy between members of the same family exclude the idea of marriage among those who are closely related by blood. Experience too proves that the physical effects of such marriages are evil. By marriage one spouse becomes a member of the family of the other spouse. The reasons which militate against the marriage of those who are closely related by blood, militate also to some extent against the marriage of those who are related to each other by affinity. However, according to the received opinion, the natural bond which exists between those who are related by affinity is not sufficient to constitute a diriment impediment of marriage by the natural law. In other words the diriment impediment of affinity, even in the direct line and much more in the collateral line, is of positive not of natural law. The positive legislation of most civilized peoples has recognized the impediment. The Mosaic law [1] enumerated the persons related to each other by affinity who were forbidden to marry. In much the same way the old Roman law forbade marriage between certain persons closely related by affinity. During the

[1] Leviticus 18:8 ff.

first centuries of the Christian era the Church seems to have adopted the Mosaic and Roman laws on this subject. Very soon, however, she began to show that she was conscious of having legislative authority on such matters, and she began to make laws of her own. The Mosaic law allowed a man to marry a deceased wife's sister, and if a woman's husband died leaving her childless it obliged the husband's brother to marry her. At the beginning of the fourth century the Church forbade such marriages as these. The 61st Canon of the Council of Elvira in Spain (A. D. 305 or 306) enacted that, "If a man after the death of his wife marries her sister, let him abstain from communion for five years". The second Canon of the Council of Neocæsarea (A. D. 314-325) decreed that, "If a woman has married two brothers she shall be excommunicated till death". When St. Basil the Great was Archbishop of Cæsarea he forbade a man to marry his deceased wife's sister. Diodorus of Tarsus reprimanded him for this, but St. Basil defended himself by saying that such marriages had always been prohibited at Cæsarea.[2]

In the old law of pagan Rome lawful marriage was regarded as the chief ground of affinity in so far as affinity was an impediment of marriage. Yet even in Roman law affinity arose from certain other unions besides lawful marriage. As Wernz says:

> Affinitas jure Romano potissimum constituit impedimentum matrimonii quatenus orta est ex nuptiis legitimis rite contractis, etsi non consummatis; veruntamen etiamsi ex contuberniis servorum originem duxit, matrimonii celebrationi obstabat. Nam L. 14, § 3, de rit. nupt. XXIII, 2 statuitur: "Item, tamen, quod in servilibus cognationibus constitutum est etiam in servilibus affinitatibus servandum est, veluti ut eam quae in contubernio patris fuerit, quasi novercam, non possim ducere". Imo, vel de ipsis concubinis (i. e. ex significatione hujus vocis in jure Romano) L. 4, de nupt. V. 4, decernitur: "Liberi concubinas parentum suorum uxores ducere non possunt, quia minus religiosam et probabilem rem facere videntur. Qui si contra hoc fecerint crimen stupri committunt." [3]

Still in spite of these exceptional cases, affinity in general was regarded as arising from lawful marriage alone according

[2] Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, I, 161.

[3] Wernz, *Jus decretalium*, IV, 654, nota (22).

to Roman law. During the first centuries of the Christian era there are no indications that Christians held any other view on the subject. The first sign of a change of opinion is met with in a passage from St. Augustine *Contra Faustum*. It was embedded subsequently in the *Decretum Gratiani* and quoted as c. 15, C. XXXV, q. 2, 3. It reads as follows:

Si vir et uxor non jam duo sed una caro sunt, non aliter est nurus deputanda quam filia.

Henceforth not marriage but carnal intercourse will begin to be regarded as the root of affinity by ecclesiastical lawyers and writers. Over and over again the words are repeated in ecclesiastical laws. One of the chief authorities for the ecclesiastical rule of affinity was an apocryphal letter attributed to Pope Gregory and given by Gratian as c. 1, C. XXXV, q. 10.

Si una caro fiunt [the Pope is made to say] quomodo potest aliquis eorum propinquus pertinere uni, nisi pertineat alteri? Hoc minime posse fieri credendum est. [Then a conclusion is drawn from the doctrine.] Porro uno defuncto in superstiti affinitas non deletur, nec alia copula conjugalis affinitatem prioris copulae solvere potest.

Another famous text attributed by Gratian to Pope Gregory but which in the judgment of Mansi belongs to Pope Zachary (A. D. 741-752) begins thus:

Porro de affinitate, quam dicitis parentelam esse, quae ad virum ex parte uxoris, seu quae ad uxorem ex parte viri pertinet, manifestissima ratio est quia si secundum divinam sententiam ego et uxor mea sumus una caro profecto mihi et illi mea suaque parentela propinquitas una efficitur.[4]

Canon 13 of the Council of Compiègne, held in the year 757, clearly indicates that then affinity arising from illicit intercourse constituted a diriment impediment of marriage in the law of the Church. A decree attributed by Gratian to Pope Gregory, but which probably belongs to the same period as the above-quoted Council of Compiègne, makes no distinction between affinity arising from lawful marriage and from fornication. The terms are very sweeping and drastic.

[4] c. 3, C. XXXV, p. 5. Decreti Gratiani.

Nec eam quam aliquis ex propria consanguinitate conjugem habuit, vel aliqua illicita pollutione maculavit in conjugium ducere ulli profecto licet Christianorum aut licebit, quia incestuosus est talis coitus et abominabilis Deo et cunctis hominibus (c. 10, C. XXXV, q. 2, 3).

According to chapters 13 and 14, C. XXXV, q. 2, 3, a man committed incest equally by sinning with his wife's relations by blood and with his own. Some modern writers have attributed the law of affinity arising from fornication to the false Decretals. What has been said shows that the law of the Church on the point was well established long before the middle of the ninth century when the false Decretals made their appearance.

Sanchez [5] defines affinity as, "Propinquitas personarum ex carnali copula proveniens, omni carens parentela". He says that the definition was accepted by St. Thomas and other theologians and by professors of both canon and civil law. It is true that subsequently he admits that Tancred and Vincent maintained that affinity arose only from lawful marriage and quoted the Roman law in proof of their opinion. But the Archdeacon, says Sanchez, deservedly reprehends these doctors, and all other doctors admit that affinity arises from fornication as well as from conjugal intercourse. The way in which Sanchez speaks of the opinion which he rejects seems to show that when he wrote the tradition that there could be any opinion on the question different from that which was commonly received had been almost lost.

Starting from the principle of *duo in carne una*, a second and even third kind of affinity was obtained. Benedict XIV illustrates this threefold affinity by the following example. Titius, the brother of Caius, marries Bertha and the marriage is consummated. Bertha contracts the first kind of affinity with Caius. Titius dies and Bertha marries Sempronius. Sempronius contracts the second kind of affinity with Caius and all the relations of Titius. Bertha dies and Sempronius marries Naevia. Naevia contracts the third kind of affinity with Caius and the relatives of Titius. The second and the third kind of affinity were abolished by the fourth Council of the Lateran

[5] De matrimonio, lib. VII, disp. 64.

in A. D. 1215, and since that time it has been admitted as an axiom that, *Affinitas non parit affinitatem.*

Owing especially to the influence of the Germanic tribes during the sixth and seventh centuries the impediment of consanguinity was greatly extended. The impediment of affinity soon followed that of consanguinity, and in the middle of the twelfth century, when Gratian wrote his *Decretum*, both impediments extended to the seventh degree in the collateral line.

The fourth Council of the Lateran (A. D. 1215) restricted both consanguinity and affinity to the fourth degree as diriment impediments of marriage. The Council of Trent restricted the impediment of affinity to the second degree when it had arisen from illicit intercourse. As we have seen, in the new Code of Canon Law, affinity arising from illicit intercourse is abolished; and affinity arising from marriage is restricted to the first and the second degree.

A practical case will help us to realize some of the important consequences of the changes in the law of affinity which have been made by the new Code.

Titius committed fornication with Bertha in the year 1917. Subsequently he married Titia, the sister of Bertha. He now comes to confession for the first time since he committed sin with Bertha. How is he to be reconciled?

If Titius married Titia after the new Code came into force on 19 May, 1918, and he is sorry for his past sins, he may be absolved without more ado. He had contracted affinity with Titia on account of his sin with Bertha, but when he married, that affinity was no longer a diriment impediment of marriage, and his marriage was lawful and valid.

If, however, the marriage took place before 19 May, 1918, it was invalid, because affinity in the first degree in the collateral line arising from fornication was then a diriment impediment of marriage. It is no longer a diriment impediment now, and so the marriage may be convalidated without any dispensation. We presume that the impediment and the invalidity of the marriage are occult. In such a case the marriage may be convalidated by the private renewal of consent on the part of Titius, since we presume that Titia still maintains her consent to the marriage (Canon 1135, § 3).

T. SLATER, S.J.

St. Francis Xavier's, Liverpool.

Studies and Conferences.

THE CHURCH AS A SOCIAL CENTRE AND SETTLEMENT WORKER.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

It has often struck me forcibly that the Church's duty as Social Centre and Settlement Worker has been sadly neglected and lost sight of in a sea of minor matters of merely routine or occasional importance. The present time and circumstances seem to demand immediate strong action.

Never has there occurred in the world such a complete upheaval and overturning of conditions as are now following upon the conclusion of the World War, which has torn mankind loose from all the traditions and beliefs and prejudices under which we have lived for several centuries. The social order is changing radically; the economic processes have been shaken to their foundations; racial differences and jealousies, while very much in evidence at this moment when every nation is striving to achieve a place for itself in what is hoped will be a peace of long standing, are visibly merging into a great community of feeling and purpose through the seizure by the laboring classes of the power which the failure of autocracy has placed within their grasp.

During the war a great development was achieved by agencies which had for years been doing a great deal of good work throughout our country. Some of these agencies have been accused in the past of using their opportunities to exploit the Catholic poor and to proselytize our Catholic youths. Some of this criticism was founded in fact; the basis of more of it lay in our own imagination and our own prejudice. While we criticized their work and methods and warned our own people against these agencies, what did we offer in place of what we forbade our own to share and enjoy through the instrumentality and facilities of others? It is with this question that we shall attempt to deal. It is an answer to this demand that we shall endeavor to give fairly and courageously.

The Church was founded as Christ's appointed agency on earth for the salvation of mankind, for whom our Saviour lived, taught, suffered, and died. It is the soul of man that Christ came to save; but His life and teachings are an undying

proof of His recognition of the existence, the needs, and the intimate correlation of the material and the spiritual man. He made his entire mission on earth one of alleviation of suffering, supplying the needy, feeding the hungry, and generally ministering to the soul through the material afflictions of men.

A great modern bishop, whose life splendidly exemplified his teachings, states very clearly the mission of the Church and its scope:

> The Church has a divine charter: her mission is to save souls. . . . But while preaching the Word is her primary object, and the saving of the individual soul the first charge upon her life and love, she would be disloyal to Him who gave her a supernatural mission and to her own historical traditions, did she not keep consciously in view the interests which are vital to the well-being of man in the wide range of his relations as a social being. . . . Moreover, in the very nature of things, the temporal interests of men are so closely related with their spiritual interests that the former cannot but affect the latter, and the latter cannot but react upon the former.

Indeed, there were glorious ages in the Church's history when the bishops and monks made her the leader in every department of industry and charity; when she was the center of all the human activities; when she ministered to all the needs of her great flock; when no other organization in the world could vie with her in supplying every requirement of the poor, the aged, the orphan, and the derelict, as well as of the youth and the wealthy and those who thrived physically and spiritually. Since the sixteenth century the Church seems to have withdrawn from the work she so long and so well accomplished, contenting herself with the administration of the Sacraments and the performance of routine works of charity in a small, provincial way, and often to the exclusion of those really most in need. It has come to appear that the Church is almost confining herself to saving the saved.

What is the Church doing for our growing body of young men and women? What is she doing for the wretched of our city slums? What attention is she giving the derelicts of our streets, the poor unfortunates whom we encounter wherever we go, those who live in squalor and ignorance because one-half of the world refuses to learn how the other half lives? Let

us be very frank about the whole matter. Let us speak the truth till it hurts. Is it not true that we have magnificent churches throughout these United States, splendid monuments to the self-sacrifice of a people who can ill afford such magnificence, and to the arduous labor of the devoted priests, whose endeavors might merit them a greater reward were they to build for the needs of the other six days of the week as well, rather than solely for Sundays and the few holidays of the year? Have we not fine houses for the parish clergy, which might be just as comfortable if less fine and more happy abodes if erected with the knowledge that in building and equipping them the needy had not been deprived of the help and the comforts they have a right to expect from God's ministers and His Church? How much organized diocesan and parish charitable work is done beyond the comparatively isolated cases that are dealt with when the priests happen across them in their visitations or in the answering of sick-calls? How really adequate are the orphan asylums and the homes for the aged and the needy? Is it not true that for every case attended to there are fifty which go unnoticed or are passed on to a diocesan agency to care for in its routine way, if it can, or to dismiss, as often happens, into the care of other organizations or the city or State?

We have for years been familiar with the excellent work of the Y. M. C. A. The methods and the unjust discrimination of this organization in the past have called forth strongly justified criticism and complaint. For its own benefit and under stress of the conditions it had to meet here and abroad during the war, the Y. M. C. A. has had to make a genuine effort to remove the causes for complaint. All the while, however, the Y. M. C. A. has done a wonderful and a noble work. You need not go far to see the benefits the youth of the land have reaped from the facilities of the gymnasium, the evening classes wherein those who must work all day may acquire the knowledge to equip them for professions and the higher and more lucrative walks of life. These young men have been taken off the streets, away from bad influences and from idling and wasting their time and energies. They have been taught to improve themselves and fit themselves for the battle of life. Every city of any size throughout the country has its Y. M. C. A.

building with all its facilities and opportunities. How many such institutions have our dioceses and our parishes for the betterment of our Catholic young men? We have an occasional organization of the kind—not enough to warrant any degree of pride. Each diocese of any size can easily afford to so organize its centers, city by city, for instance, that such an institution will be erected and maintained under diocesan direction by the several parishes of the locality. Parochial jealousies are unworthy of the Church's mission and this is a good reason and method wherefor to set them aside. Whenever a certain center cannot wholly support such an institution, even by charging a nominal fee to the beneficiaries, it should not bankrupt the diocese to supplement the work of the parishes of that particular center. Such an institution need not be established and run solely for the benefit of Catholic young men or even for young men. Its scope can and should be large enough to include all who wish to take advantage of the facilities and opportunities it affords.

One of the greatest lessons of the war lies in the unselfish work done by the Salvation Army. This excellent organization is waging a constant war on the discontent and discouragement from which a great mass of our fellowmen suffer. Nothing truer in a human sense can be said than their motto, "A man may be down, but he is never out". The Church is recognized by all, irrespective of religious convictions, as the one great organization which stands between sane and safe government and social order, and the forces of social unrest and disorder and anarchy which are working with tremendous energy throughout the world to-day. If we analyze the strength of this great bulwark of justice and right and order, the Catholic Church, we shall see that it consists mainly in her constantly and powerfully repeated principles; in the sermons of her priests, in the pronouncements of her bishops, in the encyclicals and instructions of her Pontiffs. All these are splendid, but they are far from being enough. In religion are found the true peace of the soul and a thorough understanding of and contentment with the hardships and problems of life, but a wretched, hungry outcast, a vice addict by force of circumstances into which, perhaps, his own weakness or his early environment and lack of opportunity and education have led

him, is in no frame of body or mind to be patient with preachments and high principles. The fine churches, the commodious parish houses, the sleek-looking ministers of God, are to them but a constant provocation to blasphemy and discontent. How many of these call on the priest or are visited by the priest? How many frequent the churches and the Sacraments? When do they hear the eloquent enunciations of the Christian principles, which are so well spoken and poorly practised? Our congregations are made up of those who are earning a livelihood, some more some less, and a few wealthy people. The labors of the parish priest and his assistants with regard to these are pretty much of a routine nature. The sick-calls and the parish visitations are the only occasions ordinarily when the priests of a parish come in contact with conditions and people that send a shiver through their hearts and bring tears to their eyes. This duty is often abandoned and the work pointed out in these cases is rarely followed up. Small wonder that the unenlightened victims of misfortune revile the Church and her ministers and her doctrines. The fine church amid a neighborhood of hovels, through whose portals flow the well-dressed and the self-supporting, is to these unfortunates but a symbol of smug and hypocritical conceit. These unfortunates are legion. The Church offers them no shelter, no encouragement, no helpful hand in distress. If they call at the parish house they are received with suspicion, when they are allowed in. What does religion mean to them? Why should it surprise anyone that irreligion and profanation of everything sacred are almost of the essence of the world-cancer we term Bolshevism?

Isolated acts of charity by bishops, priests, and laymen are not sufficient. We may say they count for naught. A few well-ordered institutions for the poor, the aged, the crippled, the diseased, the foundling and the orphan do not begin to fill the crying need. All these people are good and worthy and it is our bounden duty to provide for them. But they are comparatively few in the great bulk of our population, especially in our large cities. They do not include the denizens of the slums, the victims of horrible vices, the outcasts, the very dregs of society. These are the untutored, misguided tools of the leaders of anarchy, these are the bomb-throwers; these

are the ferment of the upheavals all over the world. These are the ones who need help, both for their own benefit and for the good of society. These are the crying shame of Christian civilization and, loath though we be to say it, of the Catholic Church especially.

Our institutions are too restricted in size and use. They have not advanced with the times. There is too much red tape about securing admittance; and the work they do, excellent as it is, is far too local and of too entirely routine a nature. It is at once asked what we can do with our limited resources. We cannot call further upon a generous people to furnish funds for this most widely and urgently needed work. Why should we? And why can we not if we must? In the first place, there can be no question of the resources at the command of every large diocese, and it is in the larger dioceses and their cities that these conditions exist at their worst. Nearly every diocese has a sinking or a surplus fund. It does not matter by what name the fund is known. What is its purpose? One can understand a bishop or a priest setting aside a fund against his old age and to help those who depend upon him, but a diocese does not grow old in that sense. It lives on and waxes stronger and more prosperous, unless its resources are squandered in unnecessary so-called monuments, entirely disproportionate church edifices, and the like. It seems perfectly reasonable and feasible that the diocese alone, or with the cooperation of the interested parishes of the locality, might erect an institution where the penniless and homeless and hopeless might find some simple good warm food, a good bed and bureau where sympathetic workers might extend advice and actual help to these wrecks of humanity and of injustice. The proper management would make a success of such a house. It would be a credit to the community, a matter of pride for the diocese and the Church, and it could in many cases not only afford a means of cleansing the soul, the mind, and the heart and the body of these poor creatures, but it could well count upon setting many of them on their feet again and find them some employment for which their mental and physical strength would be adequate.

This is the only treatment for anarchy, Bolshevism, and the rest of the sores that are fast rising to the surface of our civili-

zation to-day. Feed and clothe these needy ones; give these homeless discards a warm bed; see that they get some means of earning an honest living; follow them up with an encouraging guiding hand and then, and then only, will they listen to your kind words and your religious teachings. Then will they believe again in God; then will they have faith in His Church and in religion. The surplus funds of the diocese and the larger parishes will then do some good, instead of lying idle in banks and in safe-deposit vaults. When, as often happens in our cities of shifting populations, a church or a whole parish plant becomes unable to support itself, business having driven the residents to other localities, these remain idle or are partly used for some miscellaneous purposes or are sold, and the sale price is added to the diocesan funds. Why not use this abandoned plant for the above purposes, adapting it to the requirements? Or, if not advisable, why should not the bishop use the sale price for the establishment of this much-needed institution, which, for the purpose of identification, we may call a Catholic Refuge, or Salvage Home.

The Church must do her own work, not for her own flock, but for God's homeless and penniless and hopeless, whoever they are and wherever they may be. Her work, to be true to her teachings and principles, must be Catholic. She cannot leave these tasks and duties for the Y. M. C. A. and the Salvation Army, and similar societies and institutions to perform. They are doing good work, despite their shortcomings, but what they can do is not adequate; nor is it an excuse for the bishops and priests of America to shirk their plain duty. It behooves the Church in America to lead the way in taking advantage of the present-day opportunity to uphold law and order, to stay the red hand of anarchy and terrorism, to instill into the hearts of men the blessings of order and the wonders that can be wrought by the lawful power in the hands of all, rich and poor alike, rather than through the application of the torch and the throwing of bombs and the destruction of human life and property. The world is undergoing a radical change and if the Church is to do her part in the metamorphosis, she must set her hand to the work now. We have wasted much

the great needs pass to others to care for. It is the bishop's duty to organize and to broaden and carry on this work in the diocese, and it is the duty of every priest to coöperate fully, wholeheartedly, and unselfishly in the accomplishment of this task.

Before closing this article, which it is the hope of the writer will arouse our well-equipped organization to systematic action, it may not be amiss to mention as a sort of corollary to the Catholic Refuge, or Salvage Home, the settlement work of which this Refuge could well be the center. We are wont to abuse settlement workers and self-appointed philanthropists in general because of many just causes for complaint which their manner of carrying on their work has given. There is a place for settlement work; there is great need for it. Many of the needy, whole families in squalor and ignorance and worse, must be sought out to be helped. Whole neighborhoods must be purged and to be helped must be approached and conditions studied on the spot and tackled by expert, willing hands. If many of the settlement workers are self-appointed, meddling dilettanti and proselytizers, sour criticism will never remedy the condition. The Church is appointed by God to do this very work; she is the divinely ordained good Samaritan. It is her duty to engage in this work and to take up the task she has complainingly, but nevertheless almost wholly, left to others.

Had it not been for the excellent work of the Knights of Columbus and the National Catholic War Council during the period of America's engagement in the war, we should have been left in a very sorry plight, indeed. We should have suffered from a comparison with our activities in the Civil War when the Church authorities did not even think to tabulate the names of her sons who fought and died for the Union. The work of the Knights must not cease; it must continue, broaden out and coöperate through its country-wide agencies and influence in the social and settlement work which the Church must do if she is to maintain her hold and fulfill her great mission. The National Catholic War Council can well develop into a National Catholic Council for the [illegible]

him, is in no frame of body or mind to be patient with preachments and high principles. The fine churches, the commodious parish houses, the sleek-looking ministers of God, are to them but a constant provocation to blasphemy and discontent. How many of these call on the priest or are visited by the priest? How many frequent the churches and the Sacraments? When do they hear the eloquent enunciations of the Christian principles, which are so well spoken and poorly practised? Our congregations are made up of those who are earning a livelihood, some more some less, and a few wealthy people. The labors of the parish priest and his assistants with regard to these are pretty much of a routine nature. The sick-calls and the parish visitations are the only occasions ordinarily when the priests of a parish come in contact with conditions and people that send a shiver through their hearts and bring tears to their eyes. This duty is often abandoned and the work pointed out in these cases is rarely followed up. Small wonder that the unenlightened victims of misfortune revile the Church and her ministers and her doctrines. The fine church amid a neighborhood of hovels, through whose portals flow the well-dressed and the self-supporting, is to these unfortunates but a symbol of smug and hypocritical conceit. These unfortunates are legion. The Church offers them no shelter, no encouragement, no helpful hand in distress. If they call at the parish house they are received with suspicion, when they are allowed in. What does religion mean to them? Why should it surprise anyone that irreligion and profanation of everything sacred are almost of the essence of the world-cancer we term Bolshevism?

Isolated acts of charity by bishops, priests, and laymen are not sufficient. We may say they count for naught. A few well-ordered institutions for the poor, the aged, the crippled, the diseased, the foundling and the orphan do not begin to fill the crying need. All these people are good and worthy and it is our bounden duty to provide for them. But they are comparatively few in the great bulk of our population, especially in our large cities. They do not include the denizens of the slums, the victims of horrible vices, the outcasts, the very dregs of society. These are the untutored, misguided tools of the leaders of anarchy, these are the bomb-throwers; these

are the ferment of the upheavals all over the world. These are the ones who need help, both for their own benefit and for the good of society. These are the crying shame of Christian civilization and, loath though we be to say it, of the Catholic Church especially.

Our institutions are too restricted in size and use. They have not advanced with the times. There is too much red tape about securing admittance; and the work they do, excellent as it is, is far too local and of too entirely routine a nature. It is at once asked what we can do with our limited resources. We cannot call further upon a generous people to furnish funds for this most widely and urgently needed work. Why should we? And why can we not if we must? In the first place, there can be no question of the resources at the command of every large diocese, and it is in the larger dioceses and their cities that these conditions exist at their worst. Nearly every diocese has a sinking or a surplus fund. It does not matter by what name the fund is known. What is its purpose? One can understand a bishop or a priest setting aside a fund against his old age and to help those who depend upon him, but a diocese does not grow old in that sense. It lives on and waxes stronger and more prosperous, unless its resources are squandered in unnecessary so-called monuments, entirely disproportionate church edifices, and the like. It seems perfectly reasonable and feasible that the diocese alone, or with the cooperation of the interested parishes of the locality, might erect an institution where the penniless and homeless and hopeless might find some simple good warm food, a good bed and bureau where sympathetic workers might extend advice and actual help to these wrecks of humanity and of injustice. The proper management would make a success of such a house. It would be a credit to the community, a matter of pride for the diocese and the Church, and it could in many cases not only afford a means of cleansing the soul, the mind, and the heart and the body of these poor creatures, but it could well count upon setting many of them on their feet again and find them some employment for which their mental and physical strength would be adequate.

This is the only treatment for anarchy, Bolshevism, and the rest of the sores that are fast rising to the surface of our civili-

zation to-day. Feed and clothe these needy ones; give these homeless discards a warm bed; see that they get some means of earning an honest living; follow them up with an encouraging guiding hand and then, and then only, will they listen to your kind words and your religious teachings. Then will they believe again in God; then will they have faith in His Church and in religion. The surplus funds of the diocese and the larger parishes will then do some good, instead of lying idle in banks and in safe-deposit vaults. When, as often happens in our cities of shifting populations, a church or a whole parish plant becomes unable to support itself, business having driven the residents to other localities, these remain idle or are partly used for some miscellaneous purposes or are sold, and the sale price is added to the diocesan funds. Why not use this abandoned plant for the above purposes, adapting it to the requirements? Or, if not advisable, why should not the bishop use the sale price for the establishment of this much-needed institution, which, for the purpose of identification, we may call a Catholic Refuge, or Salvage Home.

The Church must do her own work, not for her own flock, but for God's homeless and penniless and hopeless, whoever they are and wherever they may be. Her work, to be true to her teachings and principles, must be Catholic. She cannot leave these tasks and duties for the Y. M. C. A. and the Salvation Army, and similar societies and institutions to perform. They are doing good work, despite their shortcomings, but what they can do is not adequate; nor is it an excuse for the bishops and priests of America to shirk their plain duty. It behooves the Church in America to lead the way in taking advantage of the present-day opportunity to uphold law and order, to stay the red hand of anarchy and terrorism, to instill into the hearts of men the blessings of order and the wonders that can be wrought by the lawful power in the hands of all, rich and poor alike, rather than through the application of the torch and the throwing of bombs and the destruction of human life and property. The world is undergoing a radical change and if the Church is to do her part in the metamorphosis, she must set her hand to the work now. We have wasted much time and energy and have unwittingly misdirected much of the funds of the church in useless or superfluous purposes, leaving

the great needs pass to others to care for. It is the bishop's duty to organize and to broaden and carry on this work in the diocese, and it is the duty of every priest to coöperate fully, wholeheartedly, and unselfishly in the accomplishment of this task.

Before closing this article, which it is the hope of the writer will arouse our well-equipped organization to systematic action, it may not be amiss to mention as a sort of corollary to the Catholic Refuge, or Salvage Home, the settlement work of which this Refuge could well be the center. We are wont to abuse settlement workers and self-appointed philanthropists in general because of many just causes for complaint which their manner of carrying on their work has given. There is a place for settlement work; there is great need for it. Many of the needy, whole families in squalor and ignorance and worse, must be sought out to be helped. Whole neighborhoods must be purged and to be helped must be approached and conditions studied on the spot and tackled by expert, willing hands. If many of the settlement workers are self-appointed, meddling dilettanti and proselytizers, sour criticism will never remedy the condition. The Church is appointed by God to do this very work; she is the divinely ordained good Samaritan. It is her duty to engage in this work and to take up the task she has complainingly, but nevertheless almost wholly, left to others.

Had it not been for the excellent work of the Knights of Columbus and the National Catholc War Council during the period of America's engagement in the war, we should have been left in a very sorry plight, indeed. We should have suffered from a comparison with our activities in the Civil War when the Church authorities did not even think to tabulate the names of her sons who fought and died for the Union. The work of the Knights must not cease; it must continue, broaden out and coöperate through its country-wide agencies and influence in the social and settlement work which the Church must do if she is to maintain her hold and fulfill her great mission. The National Catholic War Council can well develop into a National Catholic Council for the systematic direction of energy in such work as the Y. M. C. A., the Salvation Army, the Y. W. C. A., the Rockefeller Institute, and the Carnegie Foundation are doing.

Catholic America, wake up!

AN OBSERVER.

MISSIONARIES IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The great War has aroused among our priests and people a spirit of unwonted activity. At last we have come to the urgent need of united Catholic action in many fields. It seems to be the proper moment to bring to the attention of American Catholics a matter in which, as an organization, they have been shamefully neglectful. I refer to our obligations as missionaries in the Philippine Islands.

For twenty years these islands have been the wards of the United States. Much has been accomplished during that time in economic and other fields. It is time to ask ourselves what has been done by us, Catholics, for the preservation of the Faith among this people.

Nominally the Filipinos are Catholics. Certain tribes among them are still given to idolatry. Through the religious activities of Protestant bodies a small number has joined one or other Protestant sect. But the bulk of the people, in name at least, are members of the Catholic Church. There is among them, however, dense ignorance of even the most fundamental Christian doctrines. There is great attachment to the external worship of the Church; but this external worship is not, generally, accompanied by practical faith. This condition is due to the fact that, many years before the Spanish-American war, the religious instruction of the people was badly neglected on account of the unsettled state of affairs. The people were incited against their clergy, who were Spanish, on national grounds. When, as a consequence of the war, the Spanish clergy left the islands, conditions, though bad enough, became still worse, because their places could not be filled at once. Missionaries came, not from America, but from Europe, supported by European generosity. Those who came did wonderful work, but they were and are too few to stem the tide of indifference and irreligion. Many places are left without a priest; and where there is a priest, he frequently has charge of a parish of forty or fifty thousand souls! Very few parishes have parochial schools. Add to this the havoc wrought by relaxed discipline, by the Aglipayan schism, the machinations of Freemasonry, and the proselytism of the Protestant sects,

and you have a fair conception of the sad condition of the Church here.

A most surprising fact is the almost total absence of American priests. Whenever I came in touch with missionaries, I diligently inquired if there were any American priests in their district. I was aware that no mission field had been assigned to the American branch of any Order or Congregation. Yet I had thought that some secular priests had come here with the American bishops. As far as I could ascertain, there are —not counting the bishops and their secretaries—four American priests in these islands: one Augustinian, one Dominican, and two Jesuits. Possibly a few more are scattered throughout the various dioceses and mission fields of this Province; but, at the best, their number is dismally small.

Financially, we have done somewhat better. The Catholic Church Extension Society and the Propagation of the Faith are gratefully mentioned by the missionaries. But the sum total of all contributions for missionary purposes in these islands is by no means proportionate to the needs. Let us not forget that most of these European missionaries fail to receive support from their own countries, which have been impoverished by the war. Yet the work must be kept up. It is strange how apathetic we were toward *our* missions before the war. One Superior told me that if at the commencement of the war they had been summoned back home, they would not have had sufficient money to pay their passage in the steerage. An urgent appeal sent to twenty religious organizations in the United States netted almost enough to pay the postage and stationery. Undoubtedly our varied needs at home will be pleaded as an excuse for such apathy toward our missions. Before the war such a plea might have seemed plausible, and might have carried some conviction. Now it stands refuted by our record during the past emergency. We can easily do our duty toward the Church in the Philippine Islands, without neglecting the Church at home.

Priests and schools, a prelate told me, will be the salvation of these islands. He had in mind secular priests, to organize an efficient diocesan clergy. He meant higher schools, of the university and college type, as well as the indispensable parish school. We can and must supply both, or else take the re-

sponsibility of having shirked a duty toward a nation which Providence threw into our lap. During the war more than one thousand priests left their work at home to serve as military chaplains. Though needed at home they went, because they were needed more urgently elsewhere. In a short time affairs at home had readjusted themselves without any serious harm to the spiritual welfare of the faithful. Some such arrangement must be made to come to the aid of the missions in the Philippine Islands.

It may safely be stated that there are many missionary vocations among the American clergy. For lack of any missionary organization it is practically impossible to follow such a vocation. But if the organization be supplied, there will be found a goodly number of volunteers.

If it is not too presumptuous, the following plan of supplying such an organization is suggested. Let the Archbishops appoint a committee on the Philippine Missions, one of the Archbishops being made chairman. This committee should apply to each diocesan bishop for volunteers, with the suggestion that at least one in every hundred priests be allowed to become a missionary. These priests, if found qualified, should be placed on a "detached service" status for a period, say, of five years. During that time they will serve in one of the dioceses of these Islands. If at any time they should find themselves unsuited for this missionary labor, they should be permitted to return to their own diocese and resume their proper grade and file among its clergy, else they could be incardinated, after the lapse of five years, into the diocese where they have served, and thus form the nucleus of an efficient, high-minded diocesan clergy. They could select and train candidates for the priesthood from the natives, and inspire them with their own high ideals. More than one hundred American priests would, according to this plan, be placed in this mission field at once, and their concentrated effort would have an incalculable effect upon the religious life of this people. In a few generations, *Deo volente*, these natives could be won back to the Church, not merely in name, but in fact.

The financial support would not be lacking, if there were so many American priests in these islands. Having learned at home the necessity of parish schools, they would not be slow

in establishing them here. They would know where to apply for the funds, and their friends would see to it that they got them. The war has shown that people, Catholic people as well, are willing to contribute generously to a worthy cause, if the cause is duly presented to them.

There need be no fear that this plan will seriously hamper the work at home. Scarcely a diocese is to be found which cannot dispense with the services of a few priests. Many dioceses have given more than one per cent of their clergy to the army. And, strange as it may seem, vocations at home will increase in number, as the number of missionaries grows. Such has been the experience in other countries. France is the greatest missionary country in the world, yet there is no scarcity of priests for the work at home; at least there was none before the war. Holland, in proportion to its Catholic population, has a greater number of missionaries in all parts of the world than any other nation. Yet practically every Catholic family can boast of having a son, uncle, or nephew, among the clergy; and families with two or three sons priests are by no means rare. It is the way God has of blessing a country that loves its neighbor.

May American Catholics quickly awaken to the urgent needs of their long-neglected ward, the Church in the Philippine Islands.

F. X. J. EXLER, O.PRAEM.,
Chaplain U. S. A.,
Coast Defenses of Manila and Subic Bays.

DIVORCE IN THE ORTHODOX EASTERN CHURCH.

A great deal has been said about divorce and subsequent remarriage in the Uniate Church. This most important question has been settled once for all by the Holy See for the Oriental Catholic. Since the settlement in question was made for a portion of the Catholics of the East only a little more than sixty years ago, one must presume that grave difficulties stood in the way. Let me lay before the reader the teaching of the Orthodox Church on this vital question and compare it with ours.

The Orthodox do not interpret as we do the two texts of St. Matthew on this subject. According to them, in case of adultery marriage is dissolved and a new union with a third party is permitted. The Catholic Church allows at most separation *a toro et mensa*. There are these two passages: "Ego autem dico vobis, quia omnis, qui dimiserit uxorem suam, excepta fornicationis causa, facit eam moechari et qui dimissam duxerit adulterat" (St. Matthew 5:32). "Dico autem vobis quia quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam, nisi ob fornicationem, et aliam duxerit, moechatur, et qui dimissam duxerit moechatur" (St. Matthew 19:9). May one say that the innocent husband, having dismissed his wife, would commit a sin by taking another wife? The first text does not directly answer the question. The second one, on the contrary, speaks of the new union which the innocent husband would contract after having dismissed his guilty wife. According to the Orthodox Church this text should be interpreted as follows: "Whosoever shall dismiss his spouse, except in the case of fornication, and shall take another (outside of that same case), commits adultery". The Orthodox therefore forbid one to dismiss his wife and to remarry save in case of adultery of said wife; but in case of the adultery of the spouse it is allowed to dismiss her and to remarry.

This interpretation would be the proper one, if the clause "nisi ob fornicationem" be placed after the words "et aliam duxerit", as it would then affect the two parts of the sentence, "quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam et aliam duxerit." But in the actual text this exception is placed after the first part of the sentence, and we cannot say that it affects the second part. Moreover, since it comes after the first part, when it would have been so easy to place it after the second, that fact is one more reason to prove that, in our Lord's mind, the exception refers only to the first part of the sentence. We have now the Catholic conclusion, i. e., the teaching of the Church flowing, so to say, from this interpretation: "whosoever dismisses his wife, save for adultery (in which case it is allowed to dismiss her), and takes another wife (whether the first wife is dismissed for adultery or not), commits adultery.

The Greek Fathers.

The Greek Fathers amply confirm this Catholic teaching. As early as the second century Thomas says: "What will the husband do if the wife remains in her sin (adultery)? Let him dismiss her and remain alone; should he take another wife, he also would be an adulterer." [1]

The Apostolic Canons say: "If a layman dismiss his wife and take another, let him be deprived of Communion." [2] St. Basil, St. Gregory, St. John Chrysostom, and others, whilst they recognized the right of the faithful to dismiss an adulterous wife, affirm that no husband has the right to take another wife during the first wife's lifetime. And some of the texts which at first sight are difficult, in speaking of dissolving the marriage, have in view only separation "quoad torum".

These various difficulties were met and solved by the Council of Trent. Hence the clear and strong words of decree XXIV, session (can. VII). This plain speaking was absolutely necessary because, up to the Council of Trent, Oriental Uniates did admit the dismissal of the wife for adultery and a subsequent marriage of the husband with a third person. In fact the Holy See had serious difficulty in extirpating this grave abuse.

The first document issued to this effect is a pontifical instruction of Pope Clement VIII, dated 31 August, 1595. It reads: "Matrimonia inter Græcos conjuges divortium seu divortia quoad vinculum fieri nullo modo permittant." [3] In the profession of faith promulgated for Orientals by Pope Urban VIII, we read: "Item profiteor sacramenti matrimonii vinculum indissolubile esse, et quamvis propter adulterium, hæresim aut alias causas possit inter conjuges thori et cohabitationis separatio fieri, non tamen illos aliud matrimonium contrahere fas esse." [4] Pope Benedict XIV quotes this instruction in his Constitution *Nuper ad nos*, of 14 March, 1743.

In spite of these and several other instructions the Uniate Rumanians and Ruthenians persisted somehow in their condemned custom of dismissing the adulterous wife and taking

[1] Funk, *Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*, Tübingen, 1887, Vol. I, p. 394.

[2] Can. 48, Pitra, *Juris Ecclesiastici Græcorum historia et monumenta*, Rome, 1864, Vol. I, p. 24.

[3] *Coll. Sac.*, Vol. II, Col. 449.

[4] *Juris Pontifici de Propaganda Fide*, pars I, Vol. I, p. 227.

another. With praiseworthy zeal and patience their bishops did all in their power to eradicate the abuse. At last in the middle of the nineteenth century their efforts were crowned with success and the Catholic doctrine on the indissolubility of marriage prevailed. The Uniate Rumanian bishop of Forgaras (Transylvania; Hungary) received a commendatory letter from the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda congratulating him on his success in the matter.

PAUL J. SANDALGI.

Curtis Bay, Maryland.

THE LAYMEN'S LEAGUE OF GEORGIA.

THE CATHEDRAL, SAVANNAH,
August 9, 1919.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Some months since you were good enough to give space in the REVIEW to an article which I wrote on the subject of a Lay Crusade, embodying some account of the organization and subsequent work of an association composed exclusively of lay Catholics, and devoting its activities to the defence of the Catholic Church and the refutation of the many calumnies of which she was the victim in this State. I was so impressed with the excellent work accomplished by this League that I thought it well to seek for it the highest approbation. Hence I wrote to Rome and told of what it had done here for the cause of our Faith. Through the kind offices of the Secretary for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, Mgr. Cerretti, I was enabled to present the case to the Holy Father, and I have received the following letter from His Eminence the Cardinal Secretary of State to His Holiness, Cardinal Gasparri. I ask you to publish this letter. The League is still doing its work, and I am in hopes to see it extend its work beyond the limits of this diocese and find its way into every part of our country.

BENJAMIN J. KEILEY,
Bishop of Savannah.

THE VATICAN, ROME, JULY 11, 1919.

TO THE RIGHT REV. BENJAMIN J. KEILEY,
Bishop of Savannah.

RIGHT REVEREND BISHOP,

The Holy Father has received with liveliest pleasure and consolation the letter which you sent him by Monsignor Cerretti, Secretary for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, concerning the scope and activities of the Catholic Laymen's League of Georgia, which for the past three years, as was well known to the Holy See, has with full dependence on the ecclesiastical authorities undertaken the generous task of defending the truth, and has rendered such important service to our cause.

Our Holy Father desires to take occasion of this letter to express his gratification and approval to you, and this most worthy Association of Catholic Laymen, for the splendid example given to all of great zeal in defending and guarding that most precious of all heritages, our Holy Faith; and he trusts that this letter may be a yet further encouragement to them, and a stimulus to others to unite, for the safety of the supreme interests of the Catholic Religion, around the august Chair of the Vicar of Christ.

That true religious zeal cannot exist without a sincere devotion and entire submission to the Supreme Head of the Church has been once more made evident by your Advent Pastoral of 1918, which you were good enough to send, though it was already known here.

I am most pleased to inform you that the Holy Father, with all his heart, sends to you, to the Clergy of your diocese, and to the President and all the members of the Catholic Laymen's League of Georgia, and to all the faithful, the Apostolic Benediction.

I avail myself of this opportunity to express to you my sincere and high regard.

Faithfully yours,
PETER CARDINAL GASPARRI,
Secretary of State to His Holiness.

MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS. VII.

FROM YEUNGKONG, KWANGTUNG, CHINA,
January 29, 1919.

We are still together and will be until after Easter, according to the last letter from the Bishop; then Fr. Gauthier goes to take the place of Fr. Tallandier near Canton; and Fr. Tallandier, the founder of the Sun-Yi district, will take Fr. Walsh and Fr. Meyer to Sun-Yi.

Otherwise life here is a daily round of Mass, meals, and classes in Chinese, with all of us unusually happy and healthy. Fr. Price takes a daily walk through the town from five to six with *Thomas,* a semi-orphan protégé whom Fr. Gauthier raised from infancy. On Sundays the four of us—or rather five—walk for two or three hours in the country. The one walk a week seems to be enough, though there is, of course, no restriction on our going out at any time. So far, the rule of meditation in common and examen, etc., at a fixed hour has worked very well, though I imagine when once we begin our regular duties of visiting the stations it will have to be broken into.

We all have been delighted by the way the men at the Knoll and even from Clark's Green have been swamping us with letters lately. Even Fr. Price so far forgets his spirit of recollection as to smile long and brightly when they come. They are a good spiritual tonic even, for they breathe the Maryknoll spirit and recall it to us.

The Chinese New Year gaities may delay this a few days, but it will reach you surely in time to wish you the top o' the morning on St. Patrick's Day, with a prayer that God may keep you light-hearted for your glorious work.

We are getting the lay of the land around our district, and picking up a lot of good practical points on mission work from Fr. Gauthier as we go along. We are fortunate to have him. He seems to know the work from the ground up, and he is doing all he can to help us. We put a great deal of confidence in his judgment, as is natural for tyros like ourselves, but particularly inasmuch as among all the priests of the Canton mission he is said to be the one who has most influence with the Chinese. He certainly has got a way of getting under their skin. They flock round him like bees, and seem very much pleased with everything he has to say. I have an idea that his success with them lies in his politeness and patience—which are one and the same thing here. Not that he is any Lord Chesterfield exactly, but he knows just what the Chinese like and he conducts himself accordingly. The Presbyterian doctor here, a Dr. Ewers from Kentucky, told me the other day that it was hard enough for the most patient and polite man to get really

close to the Chinese, and that without these two qualities in a high degree it was absolutely impossible. He said at the same time, by the way, that Fr. P—— is exactly the style of character they like, and that if at his age he gets any language at all, he ought to be a wonderful success over here. Sounds like "flattening" Fr. P——, but if you knew Dr. Ewers, you would realize that it is not.

Fr. Gauthier, in his account of the mission, told you something about the Presbyterian mission here, I think; and I know he told you the cardinal point of their spending thirty thousand dollars a year at their plant. It is an interesting fact that the hospital, which is the *pièce de résistance* of the place, was given by the First Presbyterian Church of Jersey City. It is called the Forman Memorial Hospital, in honor of a former pastor of this Jersey City church. I wonder if any of our parishes would like to perpetuate its name in this way in China? I have an idea that very few of them would fall all over themselves to do it just now, but later it would not seem too much to hope for. The Protestants here also maintain an extra chapel on the main business street right in the heart of the city. This gives them a chance at the merchants, etc. I don't know how much they accomplish by this effort, but it certainly puts them in contact with the business people, whom we do not touch at all. We are in the city, but just in it—in what would be called the residential section of an American town. Those people who are engaged in trade in the city are the very hardest of all to convert; many say impossible, though that is pretty hard to say about any of God's creatures. If we find this feasible, we might have a lecture hall or something of the sort in the city, too. But that would be later on, when we have the situation sized up better.

Fr. Gauthier was pretty sick when he got home [from the first mission trip described by Fr. Ford]; but he has had malaria so often that he is lonesome without it. He took a lot of quinine and went to bed for a few days. I tried to keep him in bed longer, but he had been doctoring himself too long to take a fool's advice now; so after two days he stayed on his feet, and I must say that it was good treatment, for he is himself again now. By the way, those cigars you sent him

certainly grabbed him in the right spot. For days he had the "smile that won't come off."

We are all very well and happy: and, what's more, actually learning Chinese. We all send best regards to you and all at the Knoll.

Your servant in Xt.,
J. E. WALSH.

P. S. Congratulations on acquiring the new property. It was a great piece of news for us all.

February 1, 1919.

In future there is no need to trouble yourself writing about world events, as we get the Hongkong and Canton papers. The former gives us cablegrams and pro-English editorials, which we can discount; and the latter gives us some American items and strong schoolboy essays on the ability of Southern China to rule the world, or at least all China, without graft or military despotism. I have studied the papers these last two months and the only conclusion I can arrive at is that the South doesn't agree with the North, on general principles. Neither side states particular grievances very clearly, but, to believe them, they both want democracy and the destruction of Prussian tendencies discernible in the other party. The only concrete item in their wrangle is the vehement protest that Customs money must not be given to the opposite party. It amounts to seven or eight million dollars and is collected by foreigners in the open ports.

It looks as if Wilson should step in and appoint a commission to rule China till it is on its feet. The petty bandits at present know they have nothing to fear from the Government, as the Government soldiery is weak and unpaid and friendly, and moreover in the event of further trouble the bandits will be good allies. Fr. —— remarked to me, and others confirmed it, that there seems to be no such thing as civic pride or national sentiment in the Chinese; they have traveled so little and the masses are so illiterate that affairs outside their immediate surroundings have no appeal to them. The politicians have taken advantage of this to run elections as they choose and appoint favorites everywhere.

The Canton paper said that the last election in Canton passed without anyone knowing it was on, and in the *two* booths erected in the city (for over a million voters) there were a few dozen votes cast! The people are so peaceable that they are not roused by anything that doesn't touch their daily rice. Whenever the local bandits—often men in the village itself—plunder a village, instead of organizing an armed force to repel them, the rich men move their valuables to the city and leave the poor to take their chances with the looters. A half dozen guns in a village would be sufficient to scare all outsiders; and a house-to-house visit would chase out all the interns.

There is no difficulty in knowing who is a bandit; the rub comes when a family must admit that their boy is one, and the other members of the family or of the whole clan (often a large part of the village) will shield the lawless member. I know of one missioner who taught his farmers to mount guard over the village in the evenings and has had no trouble since.

At 5:30 Fr. Meyer gets up to shave and the roar of rushing waters disturbs my conscience, as it means I am oversleeping. So I turn over and wake Fr. Walsh by shouting. His healthy conscience lets him enjoy a sleep too, but from a different motive, as he never hears the alarm, while mine is a deliberate attempt to argue with the place where the pillow ought to be. Then a look at some soapy water and a moment's setting-up exercise with the toothbrush makes me think I am an Adonis. As it's too dark to look in the glass, I carry that impression with me all day till some one remarks my stubby beard. Our beds are long boards; in fact, they can be and are used for doors, two doors making a bed. (There are no knobs on Chinese doors to rub against our hip-bone.) The doors are laid on two wooden horses, and are so high and wide that you can comfortably sit or stand on them and dress, thereby pandering to sensuality, for the stone floor is cold.

I take my time in dressing, for I'm prayer reader, and they can't start without me. We say our prayers in the chapel to the admiration of the thirty or more who are waiting for Mass to begin.

Fr. Meyer and I say our Mass in a kind of side-chapel that is used as a meeting-room for the Christians. Our altar is another door-bed-board on higher props and the brick wall is our only ornament. Some days it is a distraction, but I am getting used to it now, and there I pray for you all. My memento for the living is becoming almost as long as Fr. ——'s, while the altar-boy kneels resignedly on the stone floor and probably wonders at my ecstacy.

Breakfast at 8:15 is followed by a meeting to discuss expenses and plans for the day. Study till 10:15, while Frs. Walsh and Meyer chant their Chinese lessons to the delight of curious men and women who listen in the corridor. (The Chinese must think it a mark of appreciation—and it is in a way—to observe one all day).

Dinner at 12:00, and French is the language, in honor (and consideration) of Fr. Gauthier, which rule, of course, like all rules, is made but to be broken, for it is superhuman to expect a man to carry on a heated conversation as to prospective groups of future missioners from Maryknoll, while his wrath hangs fire to think of a strong enough word in French to down his opponent. Besides, Fr. Gauthier insists on answering in *English*.

Recreation till two, during which we rush for our typewriters to pen some letters. Classes as in the morning, till 5:00. A walk through the village for Fr. Price, some Chinese dictionary "goats", that worried Fr. Walsh all day, some mending of leaks for Fr. Meyer, and, to tell the truth, I can't say what I do mostly! I pay bills, rearrange the chapel to suit my tastes and rubrics, after some devout women of the community have disarranged it to suit their tastes without rubrics; or I mail some orders laid on my unwilling shoulders by the brethren, or simply day-dream or plan articles I never write, or read a few chapters of the three books we have here: *San Celestino, Pickwick Papers*, and Fr. Faber's *All for Jesus*. We made a mistake in not bringing over a library, but it may be just as well, at least for the present, for the temptation to read is often too strong for me.

Night prayers at 6:45, and supper. We have adopted the universal practice here of night prayers before supper, as it leaves a man free afterward. Night falls very quickly here,

with little or no twilight, and bed is the only warm spot on the ranch during the cool winter months, and the only dry place now since the rainy season has begun. Of course that is an exaggeration, but it is like living in a cellar in dear old Brooklyn or any other place that is full of swamps. I have formed the habit of bringing my clothes to bed with me to keep them warm and dry for the morning; it was a little disconcerting to dress in damp underclothes in the cool morning. The boy rings "Lights out" at 9:30, but we don't hear him, at least the others don't. Night time is my best time for thinking and if I get on a strain I keep it up for a half hour or so in bed. I hear Fr. P—— in the room above us pacing the floor with his Rosary sometimes tell eleven, then I count his shoes as he kicks them off, and his bed creaks and almost immediately the snores begin, and I envy him his peaceful conscience. I suppose if I were to imitate him and pace the floor with *my* rosary, I could kick my shoes off as heartily and tumble into bed satisfied with everything. The great mistake I make is that I am satisfied with everything anyway and Fr. P—— does enough praying to make up for my neglect; besides, naturally speaking, he ought to get to Heaven before I do and he will pull me in.

It might change your ideas of China, if I tell you you have incentives to earnest prayer here that you don't get at home. At least, in my own case, I pictured the missioners as so surrounded with paganism that it gnawed their souls, so to speak, and benumbed them; while in fact it is the contrary. The fervor of the Christians, the feeling that God is being praised here even by the few, and that you are instrumental in giving Him the greatest praise possible anywhere by the Holy Sacrifice here in the midst of a people He ardently loves, supernaturalizes simple actions. Then, so far, our life here has been purely priestly, meeting people only for sacramental purposes without any of the merely social distractions that a priest at home has to go through daily.

Peace does mean a lot for the missions. Here things were paralyzed by the withdrawal of priests, and those on the job were keen about news from their home-towns that were being ruined by battle. Four years of it made some of them old men before their time and their joy now is delightful to see; they

actually sing and prattle about it and welcome their confrères who happened to be born in Alsace as newly restored brothers. I've seen a half dozen of them hugging one another, forming a circle, singing the Marseillaise, and wiping their eyes when it was finished.

F. X. FORD.

MORAL ASPECT OF THE "MISSA PRO POPULO".

St. Paul writes: "Every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer gifts and sacrifice for sins . . . and therefore he must (ὀφείλει) . . offer (sacrifice) for the people."[1] The Council of Trent applies this injunction to the pastors of the New Law, declaring that it is enjoined upon them by divine precept to offer sacrifice for the souls committed to them.[2] The new Code places this obligation upon residential bishops, abbots or *praelati nullius*, vicars and prefects apostolic, vicars capitular, apostolic administrators, parish priests and quasi-parish priests, parochial vicars, both perpetual (those having actual care of parishes constituting a moral body, such as cathedral or collegiate chapters) and temporary, such as administrators by canon law of a vacated parish, or by appointment of the Ordinary (or the pastor), as in the case of a substitute with pastoral responsibility.

The official commentary of the new Code,[3] following the Council of Trent, makes the following distinction as to the origin and force of this divine precept. Bishops are bound by the divine law absolutely, whilst non-episcopal pastors are bound in so far as the Church has committed to them the care of souls. It belongs to the Church to regulate, or if need be even to dispense ("moderare vel auferre") from, the application of this precept to those whom she ordains and commissions to the duty of caring for souls, which includes the obligation of applying the *Missa pro populo*. As a matter of fact she does so in the case of quasi-pastors, who are held to the obligation only on specified solemn feasts. For the further

[1] Hebrews 5: 1.

[2] Sess. XXIII de Reform., cap. I.

[3] *Acta Apost. Sedis*, February, 1910.

dispensation "in singulis casibus" she demands recourse to her chief tribunal. The obligation of the *Missa pro populo* rests therefore entirely in the pastoral office and not in the benefice or revenues; nor does it depend upon the removability or irremovability of the pastor, nor on the stability of his income. In other words, it is a part of the pastoral office by divine precept, which is regulated, as far as the number of Masses and the circumstances of person, time and place are concerned, by ecclesiastical law.

Although there was diversity of opinion formerly,[4] there is no longer any question as to the reality of this obligation, which is moreover a personal, a temporal (in the sense of being fixed on certain days), and, so far as the non-episcopal pastor is concerned, a local obligation. Such is the teaching of practically all modern theologians,[5] and it is clearly set forth in Canon 339 of the new Code, which provides that all Masses temporarily impeded or omitted are to be said as soon as possible. A pastor unable to apply the Mass in person, owing to illness or other legitimate causes, shall do so through a substitute; and only when this is impossible may he transfer the application to another day.[6] If then a pastor finds himself unable to apply (not merely to celebrate) the Mass for his people, he is obliged *ex justitia* to have another priest say it for him, which implies that, if need be, he must offer a priest the usual stipend, for supplying that duty for him.[7]

The fact of the obligation in law being established, we may inquire into the gravity of the obligation. The binding force of a law is determined in various ways. We may know it from the expressed intention of the legislator, from the common interpretation of the words by canonists and theologians, that is the text and context of the law, or from the declared purpose of the law under given circumstances, or from a comparison with kindred legislation in parallel cases, as also from the gravity of the penalties inflicted for a violation of the law. All

[4] Cf. Ballerini, *Op. Moral.*, II, 591.

[5] Cf. Genicot, *Theol. Mor.*, II, 227; D'Annibale, III, n. 169; Berardi, *De parocho*, nn. 97 ff.

[6] Can. 339, n. 4 and 6.

[7] Cf. St. Alphonsus, VI, 326; Goepfert, III, 87; Lehmkuhl, II, 196; S. R. C., July, 1848; S. C. C., 24 August, 1867.

these indications combine to designate the pastoral duty of the *Missa pro populo* as a grave one. Theologians seem to agree at least that the real obligation of the *Missa pro populo* as distinct from the personal, local and temporal obligation referred to above, is a grave one.[8] Their conclusion is based chiefly upon the nature and purpose of the pastoral office, in which the celebration of the Mass constitutes the great central means for promoting the spiritual welfare of the flock. All other means of grace are, as it were, grouped around and flow from the unbloody offering of the Sacrifice of Calvary. Theologians place the obligation of the *Missa pro populo* in the same category of a duty of justice as that which results from the acceptance of a stipend. Numerous decrees and decisions of the Church confirm this aspect of the *Missa pro populo*. The fact moreover that the law admits of no excuse whatever which altogether dispenses a pastor from the obligation, but only permits him to defer it, indicates the gravity of the obligation.

But whilst there can be no doubt that a pastor in the sense defined by the legislator is bound "sub gravi" to apply the *Missa pro populo*, the attendant circumstances of time, place, and person are not so strictly defined. The wording of the law indicates that only a just, but not necessarily a grave, reason is required to permit the Ordinary to allow a pastor to defer the time of the obligation (Can. 466, n. 3). The fact that explicit permission is required from the superior to defer the obligation for a time indicates that a pastor is not at liberty to exercise his own discretion in the matter, all the more since the prescribed days for the *Missa pro populo* are those on which the faithful regularly assist at the Holy Sacrifice. Similarly a legitimate hindrance excuses from the personal obligation, although in this case the observance of the stated time is insisted on, if possible. "Si episcopus (vel parochus etc.) ab ejus celebratione legitime impediatur, statis diebus applicet per alium; si neque id praestari possit, quamprimum vel per se vel per alium applicet alia die" (Can. 339, n. 4). As regards the place in which the obligation is to be fulfilled, the law is even less insistent (Can. 466, n. 4). A pastor who is legitimately absent from his parish church may fulfill the obliga-

[8] St. Alphonsus, VI, 315, 317; Lehmkuhl, II, 196; Genicot, II, 227.

tion either in the place where he happens to be or through another priest in the parish (Can. 466, n. 5).

From what has been said it follows that the duty of the *Missa pro populo* viewed in itself binds under grave sin; whilst as regards the restrictions of person, time, and place the obligation binds only "sub levi", unless the neglect implies contempt of the law, or the omission be frequent or habitual, or the fulfillment of the obligation be unduly delayed.[9]

THE NEW CODE AND DAILY MEDITATION FOR THE CLERGY.

Qu. At the clerical retreat the statement was made by one in a responsible position that the Code imposes upon priests the obligation of daily meditation, which would henceforth be binding on them by ecclesiastical ordinance, in very much the same manner as the recitation of the Breviary. Is this a correct interpretation of the law?

Resp. The Code treats of the obligations of ecclesiastics in the second book, "De Personis" (title III). Canon 125, which deals with the exercises pertaining to the spiritual life of the clergy, reads as follows:

Curent locorum Ordinarii:

1°. Ut clerici omnes poenitentiae sacramento frequenter conscientiae maculas eluant;

2°. Ut iidem quotidie orationi mentali per aliquot tempus incumbant, Sanctissimum Sacramentum visitent, Deiparam Virginem mariano rosario colant, conscientiam discutiant.

As can be seen from its wording, this Canon concerns directly the Ordinary, and only indirectly the clergy. Ordinaries are commanded, not simply advised or exhorted, to take care that clerics under their charge be faithful to certain exercises of piety, among which is meditation.

To this duty of the Ordinary to insist on the practice of mental prayer must correspond some obligation on the part of the clergy, but it is an indirect one, rather of divine than of ecclesiastical origin, not to be likened to the obligation of reciting the Breviary.

The law on the Divine Office is the subject of a distinct Canon and is formulated in a quite different manner: "Clerici in

[9] St. Alphonsus considers two months a grave matter. Cf. VI, 317.

Majoribus Ordinibus constituti tenentur obligatione quotidie horas canonicas recitandi" (Can. 135).

Here the burden is laid by the Church explicitly and directly on the clerics themselves. Nor is this a mere difference of form, as may be shown also by comparison with other Canons.

Thus, Canon 1367 ordains that bishops are to take care (the formula is the same as in Can. 125: *curent Episcopi*), that seminarians go to Mass every day, to Confession at least once a week, attend High Mass and Vespers every Sunday and feast day, serve at the altar and practise ceremonies. It will not be concluded that these are so many obligations of conscience imposed on ecclesiastical students by Canon Law.

All priests are bound, it is declared in Canon 805, to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice several times a year, and the bishop ought to take care that they say Mass at least on all Sundays and holidays of obligation.

The distinction is very clearly made here between what is of strict precept and what remains in itself of counsel, but should not be neglected by priests and must be urged upon them by their superiors because more is demanded of them than mere avoidance of sin.

In like manner, after proclaiming the obligation laid on clerics to excel laymen by sanctity of life and to be to them models of virtue, the legislator directs their Ordinary to see that they take the means (one of which is meditation) necessary to attain that perfection to which they are bound by their vocation. He thus emphasizes the close connexion which exists between fidelity to vocation and fidelity to mental prayer and other spiritual exercises. The necessity of these exercises, as a means to an end, is officially recognized and the teaching of spiritual writers on the subject receives the sanction of the law; but no really new obligation is introduced. It is the same as had been affirmed and interpreted with particular authority and vigor by Pope Pius X in his Exhortation to the Catholic Clergy, a brief extract from which may serve as a fitting conclusion to these remarks: "It is of the first importance that a certain time should be allotted every day for meditation on the things of eternity. No priest can omit this without being guilty of serious negligence and without detriment to his soul. . . . Meditation purifies the mind, governs the affections, di-

rects the acts, corrects the excesses, regulates the conduct, brings purity and order into life. . . . This summary of the advantages of meditation teaches and admonishes us not only how salutary it is in every way, but how very necessary."

THE WEST POINT CATHOLIC CHAPEL.

Few of those who visit the little Gothic Chapel at the Military Post, West Point, New York, know fully of the bitterness of the struggle which made it a picturesque reality. It is nestled in the side of a hill that looks north to the most graceful bend of the river Hudson. The building has an air of distinction about it which makes us forget the somewhat humiliating position of Catholic officers, cadets, and soldiers who lived at West Point some twenty-five years ago.

Since the brave personages who fought for it and those who were most concerned are now dead, the writer, knowing as he does its secret and strange history, is loath to let it go unrecorded.

In the summer of 1896, the Catholic officers, cadets, soldiers, and others of the same faith residing at the United States Military Academy, manifested a desire to have a suitable place in which to worship God according to their conscience. At that time the entire Catholic population of West Point numbered about five hundred, a good third of the whole population of the post. It was made up of officers with their wives and children, cadets, married soldiers and their families, unmarried soldiers and the employees of the post. They made a congregation respectable in numbers and character. Their spiritual welfare was looked after by the Right Rev. Monsignor Cornelius G. O'Keeffe, the rector of the neighboring parish of Highland Falls, where an assistant priest was maintained for the services of the Catholics at West Point. During the forty years that the wants of the Catholic members of the United States army stationed at West Point had been attended to by Catholic priests, the Government had never given any remuneration—nor had the priests sought it—for looking after the Catholic soldiers.

Nearly a half million dollars has been spent to build a post chapel at West Point in which are held only Protestant ser-

vices. It is a fine structure seated on a high hill, modelled after the once Catholic Cathedral of Durham, England; and as early as 1896 there was a handsome and substantial stone chapel situated at the south end of the rich and grassy plain.

In this chapel, erected and maintained by the Government, officiated the post chaplain, who had a commodious residence and received a handsome salary. The post chaplain is and always has been a Protestant, and Protestants have always had the exclusive use of the post chapel. Meanwhile Catholics had modestly contented themselves with demanding permission to erect at their own cost and without any expense to the Government a suitable place of worship for the Catholic officers, cadets, and soldiers of the United States Army. The permission was granted, with a building in a hollow, to the north side of the West Point parade ground, where the soldiers had their barracks, gas-houses, coal-sheds, stables, and other less sightly utilities of the military garrison. It was a wooden structure of one story, looking like a country school-house of the poorer sort or a cheap meeting-house in some rough suburb or frontier town. It was rickety and mean in appearance, with the main entrance in the rear, and altogether too small to accommodate the large Catholic congregation of the post. The want of space made it necessary to have two morning services every Sunday, which fact added to the expense of maintaining two priests at the mission attached to Highland Falls. Had the Catholics at West Point a chapel large enough to hold all of them at one service, one priest would have sufficed for both places. Another serious objection to the building was that it was outside cadet limits. Hence it was necessary that the military authorities of the post should give special permission to the cadets to attend Mass in this building.

They were marched to service and back again without having the opportunity to cultivate the acquaintance of their own clergymen. For several generations the numerous Catholics of West Point, the distinguished officers, the capable cadets, and the soldiers engaged in their country's service, had worshipped under these disadvantages without prospect of amelioration. Finally they determined to ask leave to erect at their own expense a chapel of convenient size and suitable character,

so located that it would be within easy reach of all classes of Catholics residing on the post. On 8 August, 1896, the Right Rev. Mgr. C. G. O'Keeffe, rector of Highland Falls, made application in the required form to Colonel Ernst, the superintendent of West Point, for permission to build a church on a site to the north of the parade ground. Mgr. O'Keeffe declared his willingness to have the building conform in style and material to the other buildings of the post. Colonel Ernst received most favorably the application, and it was sent to the Secretary of War, the Hon. Mr. Lamont, with this indorsement from the Superintendent:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY,
WEST POINT, N. Y., AUGUST 8TH, 1896.

Respectfully forwarded to the Adjutant-General, United States Army.

The writer is the Roman Catholic priest who resides in the village adjoining West Point. He is a gentleman of the highest character and accomplishment, and has for many years been rendering valuable service to the Government in holding religious services here, without compensation, for the benefit of the Roman Catholics who reside here. The building in which these services have been held is unattractive in appearance and surroundings, and for officers and cadets it is inconveniently located. It is also used as a chapel for enlisted men and their families who are Protestants. The number of these is not great, but that use of the building makes it necessary to provide a temporary screen for the Roman Catholic altar. It will be a decided encouragement to the religious development of an important and worthy part of the command if a separate building be provided for the Roman Catholics.

I recommend the acceptance of Father O'Keeffe's offer to build the chapel upon a design to be approved by me, the building after its completion to be the sole property of the United States.

O. H. ERNST,
Colonel of Engineers, Superintendent.

In a further communication to the War Department the Superintendent of the Military Academy wrote:

The Government has for many years provided a place of worship for Roman Catholics at this place, and the services of that church have been held regularly, the members who reside here numbering about five hundred, including officers, cadets, enlisted men and their

vices. It is a fine structure seated on a high hill, modelled after the once Catholic Cathedral of Durham, England; and as early as 1896 there was a handsome and substantial stone chapel situated at the south end of the rich and grassy plain.

In this chapel, erected and maintained by the Government, officiated the post chaplain, who had a commodious residence and received a handsome salary. The post chaplain is and always has been a Protestant, and Protestants have always had the exclusive use of the post chapel. Meanwhile Catholics had modestly contented themselves with demanding permission to erect at their own cost and without any expense to the Government a suitable place of worship for the Catholic officers, cadets, and soldiers of the United States Army. The permission was granted, with a building in a hollow, to the north side of the West Point parade ground, where the soldiers had their barracks, gas-houses, coal-sheds, stables, and other less sightly utilities of the military garrison. It was a wooden structure of one story, looking like a country school-house of the poorer sort or a cheap meeting-house in some rough suburb or frontier town. It was rickety and mean in appearance, with the main entrance in the rear, and altogether too small to accommodate the large Catholic congregation of the post. The want of space made it necessary to have two morning services every Sunday, which fact added to the expense of maintaining two priests at the mission attached to Highland Falls. Had the Catholics at West Point a chapel large enough to hold all of them at one service, one priest would have sufficed for both places. Another serious objection to the building was that it was outside cadet limits. Hence it was necessary that the military authorities of the post should give special permission to the cadets to attend Mass in this building.

They were marched to service and back again without having the opportunity to cultivate the acquaintance of their own clergymen. For several generations the numerous Catholics of West Point, the distinguished officers, the capable cadets, and the soldiers engaged in their country's service, had worshipped under these disadvantages without prospect of amelioration. Finally they determined to ask leave to erect at their own expense a chapel of convenient size and suitable character,

so located that it would be within easy reach of all classes of Catholics residing on the post. On 8 August, 1896, the Right Rev. Mgr. C. G. O'Keeffe, rector of Highland Falls, made application in the required form to Colonel Ernst, the superintendent of West Point, for permission to build a church on a site to the north of the parade ground. Mgr. O'Keeffe declared his willingness to have the building conform in style and material to the other buildings of the post. Colonel Ernst received most favorably the application, and it was sent to the Secretary of War, the Hon. Mr. Lamont, with this indorsement from the Superintendent:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY,
WEST POINT, N. Y., AUGUST 8TH, 1896.

Respectfully forwarded to the Adjutant-General, United States Army.

The writer is the Roman Catholic priest who resides in the village adjoining West Point. He is a gentleman of the highest character and accomplishment, and has for many years been rendering valuable service to the Government in holding religious services here, without compensation, for the benefit of the Roman Catholics who reside here. The building in which these services have been held is unattractive in appearance and surroundings, and for officers and cadets it is inconveniently located. It is also used as a chapel for enlisted men and their families who are Protestants. The number of these is not great, but that use of the building makes it necessary to provide a temporary screen for the Roman Catholic altar. It will be a decided encouragement to the religious development of an important and worthy part of the command if a separate building be provided for the Roman Catholics.

I recommend the acceptance of Father O'Keeffe's offer to build the chapel upon a design to be approved by me, the building after its completion to be the sole property of the United States.

O. H. ERNST,
Colonel of Engineers, Superintendent.

In a further communication to the War Department the Superintendent of the Military Academy wrote:

The Government has for many years provided a place of worship for Roman Catholics at this place, and the services of that church have been held regularly, the members who reside here numbering about five hundred, including officers, cadets, enlisted men and their

families, and domestics. It is the policy of the authorities here to encourage the religious development of all parts of the command. The erection of a separate chapel for the Roman Catholics will be a distinct advance in this direction.

The Secretary of War, Mr. Lamont, submitted Monsignor O'Keeffe's application to General Lieber, the Judge Advocate-General of the United States army, the highest legal authority of the War Department, for his decision. The Judge Advocate-General found that no law existed by which the chapel could be handed over to the United States Government for the use in perpetuity of Catholics residing at West Point. In place of this, General Lieber recommended the granting of a revocable license to build the chapel. Colonel Ernst informed Monsignor O'Keeffe officially of this decision in the following letter:

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the indorsements showing the action of the War Department upon your application of the 8th ultimo, for authority to erect here a chapel for the use of members of your church residing at West Point. The Department consents to grant you a revocable license to erect the building. This leaves in the hands of the Government the complete control of the building and of the persons who use it, which of course is essential. At the same time it gives you the exclusive use of the building while the license lasts. Such a license would not be revoked without cause. It must be assumed that the cause will not occur. Upon the whole, I think that the terms offered by the War Department are more favorable to you than those which you offer, and which I recommended, which were that the title of the building should rest wholly in the United States. But as they are different I shall be glad if you will inform me if they are accepted by you.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

O. H. ERNST,

Colonel of Engineers, Superintendent.

As Monsignor O'Keeffe had been prepared in the first instance to surrender to the Government all title to the chapel which he proposed to erect, so now he was also willing to build upon a revocable license. The War Department was informed of his readiness to build under the new conditions.

Meantime bigots all over the country were busy in composing protests for the War Department against so simple an act of religion and justice as the permission to build the

chapel. Be it remembered that these protests were not hurled against the introduction of Catholic services at West Point —for Catholic services had been regularly held at West Point for generations; nor were the protests directed against the granting of money or land to the Catholic Church, because no money was asked for, and the land on which the proposed chapel for the use of members of the United States army was to be built still remained the property of the United States. And in its license to build, the Government reserved to itself the right to have the building removed whenever such removal became necessary or desirable. The protesters had not such pretext. Their action was the outcome of blind bigotry, which would deny to the Catholic officers and soldiers in the service of the United States a respectable and suitable place of worship at the Military Academy, which would have the Catholic soldiers, cadets, and officers still continue to worship in the wretched building among the stables and outhouses, that they might be made to feel how meanly regarded is the religion which they profess by the Government which they serve.

In reference to these protests Secretary of War Lamont wrote on 3 February, 1897, to the Hon. John A. T. Hull, Chairman of Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives:

Sir: Replying to your favor of the 14th ultimo respecting a pending application for a permit to erect a Catholic chapel at West Point, N. Y., I have the honor to invite your attention to the several memoranda and statements herewith, wherein will be found answers to your several inquiries. A number of communications have been received protesting against the grant of the permit requested. Inasmuch, however, as no perceptible harm has resulted from similar permission heretofore given, and convinced that those of Catholic faith at this post—one-third of its population—are entitled to the convenience of worship which they cannot otherwise obtain, it has been my judgment that the protests are unreasonable and untenable. Under the advice of the law officers of the Department, that the right to issue such a revocable and prudently guarded license is authorized, I am disposed to approve the application, with certain restrictions, unless Congress shall order to the contrary.

Yours very respectfully,

DANIEL S. LAMONT,
Secretary of War.

From the memoranda submitted by Mr. Lamont to Mr. Hull, it was made evident that revocable licenses to erect every conceivable kind of building, including churches, on military posts, can be and had been granted by the War Department. Having passed his judgment on the protests made against the application of the Catholics of West Point to build their chapel, protests regarded by him as "unreasonable and untenable", Secretary Lamont granted on 3 March, 1897, a revocable license to the Most Reverend M. A. Corrigan, Archbishop of New York, to build a chapel on the site asked for by Monsignor O'Keeffe and agreed to by the West Point authorities.

The entire process of securing permission had been gone through so carefully and prudently that seven months elapsed from the filing of the application to the affirmative reply of the Secretary of War. The highest legal authorities of the War Department agreed that the granting of a revocable license to build the church was perfectly within the jurisdiction of the Department. The conditions attached were of a kind to secure the West Point authorities from annoyance, and to guarantee the building of a suitable chapel for the Catholics of the post. The designs were to be of the superintendent's selection, and the whole sum required for the building was to be in the treasury before the work was begun. Secretary of War Alger, who succeeded Mr. Lamont in the War Department, when President McKinley came into office, found no difficulty in reaffirming and renewing the action of his predecessor and cheerfully approved the granting of the revocable license, and assured Monsignor O'Keeffe that he might proceed with the work at once. On 27 April, General Alger gave the following statement to the newspapers: "Much has been said about the building of a Catholic chapel on the grounds of the United States Military Academy at West Point. This was a privilege accorded by my predecessor, who said that similar privileges would be accorded to others. You can state, that any other denominations wishing to building a chapel on the grounds upon the same conditions will be given an equally advantageous site for the building. No favoritism will be shown to any denomination, and others will be accorded a site equally as good as that of the Catholic chapel."

Fortified by so many official assurances, by the good will of the West Point authorities, by the decisions of the law officers of the Government, and by the official action of two Secretaries of War, and presumably of two Presidents, the sum required for the building of the chapel was collected by Mgr. O'Keeffe. Architects were engaged and money was expended in the usual preliminaries. Then, without a word of warning or a chance to be heard in the matter, the Catholics of West Point were overwhelmed by a bolt from a clear sky. In less than two weeks after Secretary of War Alger's official statement to the press, Attorney-General McKenna ruled that the Government could not grant a revocable license for the building of a Catholic chapel on its own ground at West Point, for the religious welfare of its own soldiers, and the license issued by Mr. Lamont and renewed by Mr. Alger was revoked. The distressing feature of the decision was its suddenness and unexpectedness. It struck like a shell from an enemy. Had there been the faintest hint that such a decision was contemplated, no money would have been collected or expended, and no preparation been made. Then, had it come, the decision would have been only a disappointment, whereas under the circumstances it left behind it a feeling of punishment and humiliation.

This undignified struggle waxed more intense when the question was submitted to Congress. Monsignor O'Keeffe fought incessantly for three years. Members in the House of Representatives were consumed with an ignorance and bigotry which were appalling. He tactfully arranged interviews and made speeches without number to disabuse them of overwrought notions which lodged in their heads. Finally he triumphed. His work was done. He sleeps in the West Point military cemetery with the officers, a concession granted, because of his worth, by the Secretary of War. There is no monument not even a stone or a flower on his grave. His monument crowns the brow of the hill that looks on the river to the north.

HENRY E. O'KEEFFE, C.S.P.

New York City.

OUR ALTARS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

I find Father Jansen's views a little pessimistic. He considers nearly all our altars unrubrical, and intimates that some day they shall be destroyed. "Some day," are his words, "we will have bishops and priests who will insist upon the observance of the rubrics. What will happen then to our altars as they are being built at the present time?" Of our priests he says: "I do not believe that out of the 20,000 priests in the United States, we have one per cent who are capable to judge a piece of architecture." In reply, our altars are built by experts, some of whom have their branches in Italy; their designs are well known to the ecclesiastical authorities who, while forbidding certain improprieties, e. g. electric fixtures, do not object to the beautiful marble baldachini. There is not the remotest danger that bishops and priests will become iconoclasts.

Neither are our priests so lamentably inartistic. In many seminaries they have had instruction in ecclesiastical art; in one house of studies, I am informed, they are taught just how to construct an altar. Besides this, the principles which regard good taste are not so extraordinarily difficult, but simple; a child can be taught them. Our priests have altars built: a little good judgment counts wonderfully for fine results. Nothing to my mind is simpler to begin with than an altar. In its simplest form it is only a table. Progressively it may be enlarged and ornamented until it becomes an elaborate work of art, designed according to some classic type of architecture. Its design is *multum in parvo*. Instead of leaving things absolutely to others to do, is it not incomparably better to rely on yourself? This does not exclude consultation, but it means that if you wish for the best results, you should almost make the thing yourself, examine all its parts, view it from every angle. Whilst writing I can call to mind several blunders made by supposedly good architects on whom implicit reliance was placed.

In conclusion, in confirmation of my principles, I might be permitted to quote a paragraph of a letter received from the ecclesiastical designer of one of our largest firms. He

says: "I have read with great interest your article on construction of an altar in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. If the clergy only knew how much simplicity would tell, more altars would be built with gratification to the designer and lasting beauty to all concerned."

H. A. JUDGE, S.J.

BUILDING AN ALTAR AND CHURCH ARCHITECTURE.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

An article in the September number of the REVIEW, headed "What is a Rubrical Altar?", made some just criticisms of our present-day altars. The writer finally stated that not one per cent of the priests in the United States know anything about architecture and concluded that we should put our entire trust in architects and decorators. This rather common opinion calls for a protest. If we know nothing about architecture, why not learn about it? The writer compares the priest talking about architecture to Edison talking theology. There is no similarity. We do not expect an inventor to know much theology. But a churchman should know all about churches. Many of the world's great cathedrals were designed by bishops, abbots, and priests. And why not? The priest knows the requirements of religious service. He understands how a beautiful building gives honor to God and inspires human souls. When a church is needed in the parish assigned to his care, he usually has several years to plan the kind of an edifice which is needed. He must turn to an architect for plans and specifications, but he should be able to give an outline of what is wanted. In the days of great church building, the pastor and every member of the parish had a knowledge and love of worship through external forms. Modern art has declined because we have lost interest. We leave it to paid artisans.

Fr. Jansen commends a priest who told a decorator to go ahead and use his own judgment in decorating a church. In such circumstances, most decorators would ruin a good church. They come in with a load of stencils and a variety of colors which must all be used somewhere and somehow. The church in America has few greater enemies than the decorators. The

great churches of the world are not painted. They have stone or marble interiors. The decoration is in the lines of architecture. The frescoed churches of Italy are famous, not for their architecture, but for the wonderful paintings which they contain. We have no great masters of religious art, at present. It is a mistake in this country to copy Italian borders and scrolls in churches which are of a style to which they do not belong. In most cases, white or grey or buff walls would be more beautiful and less distracting. Decorators should not be turned loose, but kept under restraint.

If we tell an architect to go ahead and design as he pleases, we should be sure that we have a good architect. It is only recently that anyone in this country has known anything about church architecture. The schools have ignored it until recently. There are only a few American architects who design good churches. Ralph Adams Cram has aroused interest in the best Catholic art. But the inspiration is too recent to produce far-reaching results. We cannot leave all to the architects. We must know something about it ourselves. An architect will put forth his best efforts when working for one who appreciates his labor and can discuss his plans understandingly. The priest who knows something about it will not ask an architect to "violate the canons of his art". He will avoid glaring colors and polished brass ornaments, as he avoids celluloid collars and patent leather shoes. Some well designed churches have been spoiled by the decorators and furnishers. There will be an improvement only when the priests themselves have good taste in such matters. There are numerous monographs and histories of architecture. (Not, however, in the catalogues of Catholic publishers.) One may learn a great deal by examining in detail churches known to be of good style. Seminarians should hear an occasional lecture on the subject. And above all, we should abandon the idea that it is not our concern and that it should be left to professional architects.

FRANCIS E. WALSH.

Camp Grove, Illinois.

CONSTRUCTION OF AN ALTAR.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In the July number of the REVIEW, Father Judge, S.J., contributes an article on "Suggestions for Constructing a Simple Altar" and invites discussion of this subject.

I would begin by reference to the last sentence of Father Judge's article. He assumes that the reader's ideal altar is a "dream of chaste beauty and elegance in Carrara marble". And he would construct his "simple" altar so as to make it a cheap imitation of the Carrara affair. It would no doubt be of wood painted white; it would have meaningless column and arch work at the front of the mensa; it would have of necessity two steps for the candles and flower vases; and some more meaningless column and arch work for a reredos. Pilasters, columns, rosettes and whatnots that go under the name of "ornament" would be of the compo and papier-maché kind that certain companies offer in truly "bewildering array". Also, wall-paper firms have "elaborate moldings in gold and glittering colors".

But my ideal does not happen to be the "dream of chaste beauty and elegance in Carrara marble" or its several imitations. When will the Catholic Church in the United States rid itself of the kind of altar which Ralph Adams Cram has well called a "glorified soda-fountain"? Will things actually go from bad to worse until we have added mirrors for additional glittering effect? Are we convinced once and for all that a beautiful church can only be secured through the use of polished marbles (or imitations thereof)? The lobbies of theatres and hotels are beginning to break away from the rule, leaving the white marbles for barber-shops, moving-picture houses—and Catholic churches.

My suggestion for a simple altar would be to consult a really competent Catholic architect from among the few that there are in the country. Or if you must do the altar yourself, at least be guided by what good architects have done.

In New York City the altars in the Church of St. Vincent Ferrer, the work of Mr. Anthony, will offer valuable suggestions. The same artist has provided a rather simple altar for the Church of St. Gregory in Harrison, N. Y. In St.

Paul and elsewhere the work of Mr. Comes offers worthy models. In all these examples one will learn at least that an altar is not best made by nailing together a lot of miscellaneous matter.

Why not build a simple table of good, solid wood, with four substantial columns actually forming the "legs" of the table; dispense with steps or gradines on the table; have a six or eight-sided tabernacle standing on the table; then, hang antependiums (of the various colors) in front, and in place of a reredos hang a dossal with its wings all about the rear and sides of the altar; you can also add something of a cloth canopy above the tabernacle; let your linen altar-cloths be accommodated to the tabernacle and not vice versa; do not let the linen hang over the front, and avoid all lace (especially "gold-lace").

In this scheme you may have to give some special care and money to the tabernacle and to the hangings. But you will not have to expend money constantly for "floral decoration".

All in all you will not be working backward from the white Carrara affair; you will rather be working upward from the simple table of the Last Supper, the simple table-altar of the first Roman Pontiff. Your altar will have as its basis the essential table, with the addition, then, of things that have meaning and fitness, not with accretions drawn from commercial catalogues.

WM. A. BUSCH.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

ACCEPTING MONEY ON SICK CALLS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

May I ask space in the REVIEW to protest against the vulgar practice of soliciting or encouraging "offerings" of money made to a priest on occasion of visiting the sick? The notion among our Irish people that a visit from the priest is to be recognized by some gift, has its origin no doubt in a condition of the past when, as in penal times, the clergy received no fixed salary but depended upon the generosity of those to whom they gave the Sacraments, without having the necessaries of travel and sustenance. Here in America it is out of place

and a subject of scandal to those who believe that the Sacraments of the Church are to be administered free. The practice should be frowned down by bishops, because it is on a par with that of paying for indulgences and absolution in the confessional, which Protestants falsely accuse the authorities of the Church to have allowed in the past, and which is said to have given occasion to the Lutheran schism. A good Catholic layman recently informed me of the wretched conviction which he found among some poor parishioners whom he had been urged to visit as a member of a newly established local St. Vincent de Paul Society, that they were expected to give money to the priest if he came to them. They had failed to call for the Sacraments in a real case of necessity, simply because they had nothing to give to the "Father". I convinced myself of the fact, and found that quite a number of the parishioners were under the same impression, namely, that the priest expected it, and that it was a custom for him to accept money on his visits to the sick. He is not an American, I am glad to say, and may have come from a place where the custom has some justification; but his present position does not warrant the practice, and is a disgrace to the Catholic Clergy and Church in the place where he now lives.

PAROCHUS AMERICANUS.

MISSIONARY EFFORT IN OUR OWN LAND.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Father Judge in the September number of the REVIEW has sounded a call to a new crusade. He has made it clear that, whatever may be said about the necessity of workers in the Foreign Missions, in China, India, along the West Coast of Africa, there is the very greatest need of apostolic effort here at home, especially in the Southern part of our country. One may have thought he was well acquainted with conditions in the United States. To such a one it must come as a challenging surprise to learn what Father Judge relates of the intolerance and bigotry in wide districts of the Southern interior. The fanatic and the ignorant zealot have here had the freest opportunity for their propaganda of calumny against the Church, her priests and consecrated women. Are they to be left in

unquestioned possession of the field? If not, how may they be met and their evil influence counteracted?

In our easy and successful way of jogging along we take it for granted that the regular means used by the Church for making known the Gospel, work efficiently and constantly, and that we need not give ourselves trouble about problems which do not immediately concern us. If effort is needed anywhere the Church will supply it. The zeal of our priests and the sacrifice of our sisterhoods will be equal to any emergency. Thus we think, good easy men and women, and as we enter our churches to pray we thank God that religion should be so prosperous. It comes as a distinct jar to us to read that in this century and in enlightened America there are places, many places, whole territories where the most grotesque things are believed in regard to the Church, and the vilest calumnies are uttered against those to whom we accord the highest respect. The ordinary methods of ministration will not be effective to meet such a state of affairs.

The hierarchy and priesthood of our country have been the leaders in the diffusion of the word of God. The laity have been generous coöperators and have contributed vastly more by example and zeal than in money to make known our holy religion. But in the parts of the South to which Father Judge refers, priests will not be permitted a hearing and the settlement of any considerable number of Catholics is not to be looked for. Groups of a dozen Catholic families scattered here and there would go a long way to solve the problem. In the unwillingnss to hear priests and in the absence of Catholics, what other means have we at hand to reach these people?

We are told that a lay apostolate of young men and women prudently distributed and giving of their devotion and enthusiasm under wise guidance will be exceedingly helpful. If this is so it would seem that the movement will be encouraged. There is no lack of zeal amongst our people. Generous souls in every part of our land yearn for an opportunity to make known the claims of Christ and His Church. Priests are always willing to second a worthy effort, only let it be worthy. The spirit of the Crusader is ever alive amongst Catholics. In any event the call to missionary effort in our own land is interesting.

FRANCIS T. MORAN.

St. Patrick's Church, Cleveland, Ohio.

A SPIRITUAL MILITIA.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

I have been interested for some years in Father Judge's work in the South, and I think he has struck a note that henceforth will be found to vibrate more and more throughout the Church in the United States. Every priest whose work throws him into the complex maze of modern city life is astonished at the zeal of the laity whom he finds willing to coöperate in his every activity. Father Judge shows what can be done by welding together a group of earnest women for common action. Other priests doubtless could present experiences quite parallel, even though in a different field. Some of the finest schools in the world for the deaf are conducted by a group of lay women. In Pittsburgh, for instance, there is a society of several hundred young women, most of them Catholic teachers in the Public Schools, who do volunteer work in the evenings and on Saturdays and Sundays, in settlements, night schools, and in catechism classes, and clubs for girls, fresh-air farms and camps for girls, and kindred work. The sum total of their quiet efforts is simply amazing. It is work that could not be done by any of the standardized religious communities. The Religious Orders are not plastic and pliable enough for many of the newly created needs of modern society. The holy rule stands in the way. Rather, in many cases, let it be said with sorrow, the misinterpretation of the holy rule is the hurdle set up by reactionary superiors, who, violating Holy Scripture, stick to the letter and violate the spirit of the rule.

For the ends which they were designed to achieve, the religious orders are, of course, admirable. But one is not an ecclesiastical Bolshevist to seek for something new. Like the householder in the Gospel, we long for new things and old. The last word in religious communities has not been said by any means. With the changing character of modern life, the time has almost come, it seems to me, for a new saint to arise and point out the way for us to utilize the laity more and more as the strong right arm of the Church.

Modern American women are not too fond of uniforms that are spectacular; nor do they fancy a community that appears in public in a hat of the vintage of 1866, or earlier, like the

Salvation Army. To wear an up-to-date hat runs counter to none of the Commandments, Precepts of the Church, or counsels of perfection. Even as a point of economy, and a corollary to the vow of poverty, there well might be a revision in the unnumbered folds of black, layer upon layer, which many nuns wear, even in the torrid atmosphere of the United States. Our modern American Catholic college woman is not in love with a rule of life that compels her to forgo the pleasures of educated society; she does not look with attraction upon an ordinance that requires her to be in the house at dusk; that prevents her from playing tennis, or taking long walks, or keeping a sound body by athletic exercises appropriate for Catholic women. She does not feel inclined to give up forever attendance at lectures, or concerts, or conventions, or university extension courses. She shrinks at the thought that never again will she visit an art exhibit, or a sculpture gallery, attend a Social Service Seminar, hear a classic opera, or spend a week-end at a watering place to rest her weary head, and swim the mighty deep. She desires a large measure of legitimate and innocent freedom of movement and action, and declines to be put into a groove, or to ask permission for every single thing that she needs. At the same time she is now leading, and will continue to lead, a sane and saintly life, outside the cloister. She wishes to dedicate herself to God, to devote to Him and the Church her talents and her ability, whatever they be, but she wants to make her living at the same time.

Hence I feel that some time, and that soon, there will arise a leader in Israel who will show us how to attract such a group of lay women, young, healthy, saintly, bubbling over with enthusiasm, eager to do a certain work, but unwilling to live hidden from society; anxious to live in the world but not of it; resolved to go to daily Mass and Holy Communion, but at the same time to enjoy the advantages which modern educational and social facilities present to them in the evenings. What we need to-day is a group of educated Catholic lay women, well dressed, attractive—and the better looking, the better fitted are they to make an impression—sane in their attitude toward all modern problems, because they are saintly in their lives, to bind themselves together, no matter how

slender the cord, to work for God, and to present to the swiftly moving modern world a front elastic and responsive, so that they may cope with modern society as the handmaidens of God. Anchored firmly in faith, hope, and charity, there would be no fear for their individual piety, and moving as a solid phalanx, with that large measure of the freedom of the children of God, they would be the saviours of the modern world.

Such women are waiting in abundance. God in His own good time will send them a leader.

THOMAS F. COAKLEY.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

"DANCING PARTIES" AND THE COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE.

A zealous pastor who frowns upon dancing among Catholics because the practice, much like card-playing and brandy, has a bad name, comments adversely upon the answer given in the August number of the REVIEW under the heading "Priests and Dancing Parties". He holds that dancing parties, even for good objects promoting religion or piety, are an abuse, and that the proceeds of such entertainments is "tainted" money, which a priest may not accept for religious purposes. In support of this view a canon from the Council of Baltimore is cited: "Mandamus quoque ut sacerdotes illum abusum, quo convivia parantur cum choreis [*balls*] ad opera pia promovenda, omnino tollendum curent."

We have in the many instances when discussing the question directed attention to the distinction between dances that are a danger to morals, and dancing as a popular amusement indulged in for recreation. The latter is not illicit, though it has its dangers for the individual. Certain methods and functions connected with balls violate decency and modesty and are therefore forbidden by the moral law. In some cases dancing, like wine and card-playing, becomes a direct occasion of sin, against which Christians are to be warned. On the principal that "Qui amat periculum in illo peribit," the Church as the guardian of morals formulates definite precautions against the peril of sin, and this is the object of the Council of Baltimore when it forbids *convivia cum choreis*.

What the Bishops of the Plenary Council forbid is not dancing, but a certain class of dancing parties protracted into the night after banqueting, when the bodies and the imaginations of the participants are heated to the danger point of passion. "Convivia cum choreis", when they constitute an abuse, are very different things from dancing as a mere amusement. Glycerine has a soothing and healing virtue, though in connexion with certain chemicals it becomes an explosive calculated to destroy health and life. So here. *In medio virtus.*

CONFESSIONS OF RELIGIOUS "FOR THE PEACE OF THEIR CONSCIENCE".

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

May I call the attention of the readers of your esteemed REVIEW to what I think is an important inaccuracy on page 71 (and pp. 109 and 110) of *The New Canon Law in its Practical Aspects?* It is there stated that "Sisters may validly and licitly confess to any priest approved by the bishop of the diocese for confessions in general, if they make their confession in a church or public or semi-public oratory".

This is indeed in perfect harmony with a decree issued by the S. Congregation of Religious in 1913, which states that "when nuns (sisters) are outside their own house, no matter what the reason, they may confess in any church or oratory, even semi-public, to any confessor approved for both sexes", etc. But the latitude allowed by this decree is qualified and restricted by the new Code of Canon Law (Can. 522), which states that "if, notwithstanding the prescriptions of Canons 520 and 521, any religious, for the peace of her conscience, have recourse to a confessor approved by the local Ordinary, etc., this confession, whether made in a church or oratory, even a semi-public oratory, is valid and licit". It appears from these words that a religious may thus make her confession, not in general or for any reason whatever as allowed by the decree of 1913, but only for the peace of her conscience. This is a *conditio sine qua non*, without which confession to a priest not approved for religious would be exposed to invalidity. A CONSTANT READER.

Resp. With all due regard for this emphasis on the phrase *for the peace of their conscience*, we think that our correspondent is straining the sense of the words in their application to the freedom permitted by the Canon (522). The

chief motive which urges Catholics to make a confession at any time is "for the peace of their conscience". There may be a hundred other motives, but this one is permanent, even if the penitent be not conscious of its presence as a distinct reason. If the canon mentions it expressly, it is not because a sacramental confession can ever be without it, but because that one motive, ever present, is sufficient, no matter what other reasons may coëxist with it. It confirms rather than limits the decree of 1913.

On the other hand, the desire to secure peace of conscience must be a distinct motive for the religious to seek a confessor outside the appointed opportunities for confession. Otherwise there will arise abuses, as when a religious regularly goes abroad and either mistakes or misuses her liberty to the detriment of conventual discipline and good order to which she has bound herself by voluntary contract. Hence the clause "for the peace of her conscience" is not a mere rhetorical phrase, but implies that conscientious motive is to regulate and check the privilege of going to confession outside the convent.

WAX CANDLES FOR THE ALTAR.

We have on former occasions thoroughly discussed the subject of wax candles for the sanctuary. (See Index, "Wax Candles.") Nevertheless the question of what percentage of admixture to pure beeswax is permissible by liturgical law is brought to us repeatedly by those whose responsibility bids them control the manufacture of lights for divine worship. The answer is simple enough. The law of the liturgy demands, for symbolical reasons expressed in the rite of the solemn blessing of candles, that the candles on the altar be of beeswax—pure beeswax, as far as it is possible: first in regard to the two candles always required for the celebration of Mass; next and in a less rigorous sense for the other candles used in liturgical functions on and about the altar of the Blessed Sacrament

The chief difficulty in observing the law arises from the inability to obtain absolutely pure wax candles. Hence the mitigation "as far as possible". In some countries it is difficult to obtain wax in sufficient quantity; in others the wax

is of a quality that liquifies or softens under high temperature and offers danger of fire. We are assured by a prominent manufacturer that neither difficulty exists in the United States to such an extent as to make it impossible to supply pure wax candles necessary for Catholic worship. Full observance would probably entail a change from the thin taper-like form of our conventional candle to a thicker more compact form, such as is used in European churches; and the manufacture would add to the former price. The S. Congregation leaves it to the conscience of the Ordinary whether and to what extent the clergy of his diocese can procure pure wax lights for the altar.

THE "FORTY HOURS" ON ALL SOULS' DAY.

Qu. In the July issue of the REVIEW there is a decree of the S. C. R. regarding the celebration of the Solemn Votive Mass *SS. Sacramenti* or *de Pace*, when the Forty Hours' Devotion is observed on All Souls' Day. In this diocese, (1) one church begins this Adoration on 1 November; (2) in another church, dedicated to the Holy Souls, it begins on 2 November. How does this decree affect these churches?

Resp. According to the Clementine Instruction, on feasts of the first and second class, doubles, the Masses of the Blessed Sacrament at the Exposition and Reposition and *pro Pace* cannot be celebrated, but the Mass of the current office is sung and the commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament or *pro Pace* is added *sub una conclusione* to the oration of the current Mass. Now, by the decree *Urbis et Orbis* of 28 February, 1917, All Souls' Day is placed on a par with the primary solemn feasts of the year. Hence the Mass *pro defunctis* must be said on that day. The commemoration, however, of the Blessed Sacrament cannot be added in a Mass for the Poor Souls.

1. With regard to the first case, we must distinguish between Adoration interrupted during the night and uninterrupted Adoration. (a) If the Adoration is *interrupted*, the Mass for the Poor Souls is chanted in *black* vestments before the exposition on the second day. After exposition the Mass *pro Pace vel alia necessitate, arbitrio Episcopi*, is celebrated, not at the altar of exposition nor on the altar on which the Particles

are kept for distribution of Holy Communion to the laity, but on a third altar. (b) If the devotion is *not interrupted*, a Mass for the Poor Souls is chanted, at the altar at which the Communion Particles are reserved, in *violet* vestments, and the Mass *pro Pace*, etc. on the third altar. However, it must be noted that this Mass must be *chanted*. If it be a *private* Mass, it must be *pro defunctis*, in *violet* vestments.

2. Celebrate Mass for the Poor Souls before the Mass of Exposition. The Mass *pro Pace* will occur on 3 November, and will be as usual heretofore.

If the Mass of Exposition occurs on 31 October, the Mass of Reposition and the Procession will regularly take place, and the Mass for the Poor Souls will follow the Mass of Reposition.

THE BURIAL MASS ON ALL SOULS' DAY.

Qu. If a body is buried on 2 November, is the Mass *in die obitus* to be said?

Resp. The S. C. R., 10 January, 1919, decreed that on 2 November, on this occasion, one of the Masses prescribed by the Const. Apost. *Incruentum altaris sacrificium*, 10 August, 1915, be said, but that the oration for the deceased be added *sub unica conclusione*. Justly so; for the Mass *in die obitus vel repositionis* is in a manner a votive Mass. Now 2 November is equivalent to a feast of the first class. Since on feasts of the first class votive Masses are not allowed, but the Mass of the current feast is celebrated, and the commemoration of the votive Mass is added *sub unica conclusione* to the prayer of the Mass (e. g. Forty Hours' Devotion), so also on this occasion.

WAS THE MARRIAGE LEGAL?

Qu. John and Mary present themselves to Father Jones to be married. Father Jones ascertains that John is a Protestant and that Mary, though a Catholic, belongs to the neighboring parish. He tells them that he cannot very well do what they desire, since he disapproves of mixed marriages in his parish, for they frequently end unhappily for both parties and certainly for the children in case the marriage is blessed with issue. After some persuasion John consents

to be instructed in the Catholic faith and for this reason the ceremony is deferred for some weeks. Father Jones puts him through a brief course of religious instruction and receives him into the Church. Two weeks after the first instruction, he marries them, without however having notified the girl's pastor or the bishop. Was Father Jones within his right in acting as he did? Is the marriage valid, and may he retain the stipend?

Resp. The marriage was valid, so long as Father Jones performed the rite within his own parish limits, unless, indeed, there are other canonical impediments.

Whether or not the marriage was licit, will depend upon the reasons which both parties, or the Catholic girl in the first instance, had for going out of her own parish for the ceremony. Assuming that they did not intend to reside in the parish to which they came to be married, there may yet be valid reasons why the girl did not wish to be married by her own pastor. A valid cause in such cases is any good reason, even if it be not an urgent or grave one. Hence personal repugnance, or a sense of utility or convenience would be sufficient grounds for having the marriage ceremony performed outside one's parish by the local pastor or a delegated priest.

Even though there were no reason for going to another parish, the marriage would still be valid; but the priest who performed it without due title would be obliged to return the stipend to the legitimate pastor, that is to the pastor of one or both of the parties.

FOOTGEAR IN THE CELEBRATION OF MASS.

Qu. In celebrating the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, is there a rubric requiring the priest to wear footgear with heels?

Resp. Whilst the liturgical tradition of the Church indicates that the celebrant of the Mass is to be becomingly shod, there is no special rubric regulating the matter of footgear, except in the case of bishops and privileged dignitaries who wear "sandalia" in the sacred ceremonies. St. Charles in his "Regulae et Instructiones de nitore et munditia ecclesiarum," promulgated in the Milanese Synod (XI), ordains: "Nullus sacerdos ad missam faciendam accedat foedis calcis aut crepidis; ideo semper crepidae in sacristia habendae sunt ad

ejusmodi usum." Commentators on the Ceremonial of Bishops (chapter "De caligis et sandaliis") intimate that on rare occasions in penitential processions priests were found to celebrate barefoot, whence the ceremonial was styled "Nudipedalia"; but that the absence of footwear was traditionally regarded as a mark of degradation.

THE RETREAT FOR ARMY CHAPLAINS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Concerning the obligation of the military Chaplains to make a spiritual retreat, I am in receipt of the following information, which I received from our Superior General residing in Rome: "Il n'est pas douteux que les aumôniers militaires sont, tout comme les autres soldats, sujets aux prescriptions de la Congrégation Consistoriale du 25 Oct. 1918. A tous ceux, qui ont demandé, on a repondu 'Affirmative', et tous les aumôniers militaires d'ici ont dû s'y soumettre.

JOSEPH STETTNER, M.S.C.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

WHITHER? AN ANGLICAN QUERY.

I. The Case of Bishop Gore. It is a far cry from Oxford to Wilmington. And yet that cry is: "Whither?" Bishop Charles Gore has resigned the Anglican see of Oxford. Bishop Frederick Joseph Kinsman has resigned the Episcopal see of Delaware. Neither has "gone over to Rome". Whither are they two going? It looks as if they could no longer put up with the discorporate thing that the Anglican communion has become. Why not? Because many of its leaders have departed from the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion either by gauging them up or by guaging them down; either by approaching nearer to Catholic teaching or by slinking into rationalism. Which way will Bishops Gore and Kinsman take? Neither of the foregoing illogical ways, we hope; rather the logical way to Catholic truth.

The first illogical way of some Anglican leaders is that of only a partial advance toward the true Church. There are Anglican and Episcopal clergymen who simulate absolution, although Article 25 speaks of Penance as a corruption from Apostolic teaching; and simulate the Catholic liturgy of the Mass, although Article 31 bans the sacrifices of the Mass as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits". It would be far from logical on the part of Bishops Gore and Kinsman to go the way of these deluded ministers, whose chief concern "is the controversy which rages round the Ornaments Rubric—the problem which the daily press has dignified by the title of 'The Crisis in the Church'".[1]

The second illogical way of Anglican and Episcopal leaders is that which degrades faith to naturalism. We list a few of the prominent Anglican writers who wear the horrid stripes of rationalism. Dr. Lake of Harvard makes Jesus out to have been a dupe to a fanatic and phantastic expectation of an impending, cataclysmic end of the world. Dr. Charles Frederick D'Arcy, Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore, draws

[1] *Contentio Veritatis.* p. v (London, Murray, 1907).

the ecclesiastical revenues that should go to the Catholic Bishop of Down and Connor, the Right Reverend Joseph MacRory; and, in lieu of a flock to pasture, strikes the pose of a Hegelian pantheist. Bishop Mercer is a voluntaristic pantheist. The late Dr. Figgis, at the Presbyterian College of Lake Forest, north of Chicago, sympathetically discoursed on the abominations of Nietzsche. Bishop Henson of Hereford puts Muhammedanism on a par with Christianity. Dr. Cheyne, who was Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Scripture, University of Oxford, became a Bahaist; yet, at his death, received the obsequies of Canon of Rochester. The late Archbishop Temple of Canterbury denied the Virgin birth and the resurrection of our Lord. To this list could be added many other names of prominent Anglicans, whose Christianity might as readily be looked for in the Quran as in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. Will Bishops Gore and Kinsman follow such leaders? Oh, no! Had they been of that tribe, they would have held on to their benefices; and would have gone the way of their own sweet wills in the matter of doctrine, without let or hindrance from creeds or scruples or taboos. For on the Broad Church way, Anglicanism is what you will. Whither the two are going, one scarce can say.

In view of the utter lack of unity of faith among the leaders of the Anglican communion, it is simply beyond the comprehension of a Catholic that three Episcopal bishops of the Middle West recently went all the way to Rome in order to ask Pope Benedict XV to favor corporate reunion of the Church with such a discorporate corporation as the leaders of Anglicanism show their sect to be.

1. *Bishop Gore's Change.* Dr. Charles Gore, at first a member of the Community of the Resurrection, then Canon of Westminster, and finally Bishop of Oxford, was not always on the side of what Anglicans call orthodoxy. Dean Strong admits that Canon Liddon "most strenuously opposed" the theories of Gore's essay in *Lux Mundi*—especially the kenotic explanation of our Lord's human knowledge, and the rejection of the traditional view of the authorship of the Old Testament books.[2]

[2] *The Miraculous in Gospels and Creeds.* By T. B. Strong, Dean of Christ Church, Oxford (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1914), p. 4.

To these errors of years ago, that have never been sincerely retracted by Dr. Gore, his enemies of the left wing of Anglicanism refer with many a chuckle. When the visible head of the Anglican Church, the Nonconformist Lloyd George, appointed Dr. Hensley Henson, Dean of Durham, to be Bishop of Hereford, December, 1917, Mr. Theodore Brocklehurst hailed the appointment in the *Westminster Gazette*: "Easy it is to picture the alarmed horror on the faces of those hilarious backwoodsmen, when the Henson bomb was thrown into the Cowley camp." The "hilarious backwoodsmen" are the party of Bishop Gore among the Oxford clergy. They had protested against the naming of Henson on the ground that he did not believe in the Nicene creed. So Mr. Brocklehurst asks them: Does the Bishop of Oxford believe in the Nicene creed? He goes on:

> In Dr. Charles Gore's fourth lecture on "The Historical Trustworthiness of the Gospels", delivered in St. Philip's Church, Birmingham, at noon on Dec. 10, 1902, his *ipsissima verba* were, "The evidence of our Lord's birth of a virgin was not part of the original Apostolic testimony, and still to-day the question is not ground on which belief is asked". [3]

The Rev. Burnett Hillman Streeter, when about to present to the reader his fancy-sketch of "The Historic Christ," opens up his essay by reminiscing about the quondam kenotic theory of his own bishop, Dr. Gore:

> Twenty years ago Orthodox Theology was awakened with a start by the present Bishop of Oxford to a clear recognition of the fact that the human knowledge of our Lord was limited within the scientific and historical horizon of the mind of His own age.[4]

Has Dr. Gore changed any of his radical opinions since those days? Has he shifted ground in matters of faith since editing *Lux Mundi* in 1890? He has not told us so. And yet he does now insist that the facts stated in the Apostles' and Nicene creeds are essential to Christian faith.[5]

2. *Bishop Gore's Charge.* Some five years ago, the bishop attempted to stem the tide of rationalism in his diocese. He

[3] *The Tablet*, 22 Dec., 1917.

[4] *Foundations* (London: Macmillan, 1914), p. 75.

[5] *Basis of Anglican Fellowship*, Preface to 5th ed. (Oxford: Mowbray & Co., 1914), p. 3.

published *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship in Faith and Organization, an open letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford.*[6] Dr. Gore then deemed that the Anglican church had a special mission along a *via media*, that lay between the Scylla of Rome and the Charybdis of rationalism:

> The constant intensification of papal autocracy, the augmented stringency of dogmatic requirement, and the rapid development of modern devotions to extravagant lengths, in the Roman communion on the one hand, and on the other the amazingly rapid disintegration of the distinctive creeds of Protestantism, have produced a religious situation in which there is even a clamorous need, felt far beyond our own borders, and as much in the Far East as at home, for the special witness of our communion—its witness, I mean, to a catholicism which is stable and in undoubted continuity with the whole movement of the Church in history, while at the same time it allows its members and officers the greatest possible freedom to move and think and act for themselves.[7]

3. *A Broad-minded Charge.* Along this *via media*, the bishop allows to his clergy and laity "the greatest possible freedom to move and think and act for themselves". He is still the broad-minded Anglican.

It was that broad-mindedness of the Anglican communion which attracted Dr. Charles Augustus Briggs. He was not yet a full-fledged Modernist; nor had he given the impression of Romeward tendencies, because of a community of ideas between him and such Modernists as Von Hügel.[8] Briggs had not yet been suspended from the Presbyterian ministry by the General Assembly of the Presbytery, 1893; nor had he taken orders in that elastic body called the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1900.[9] Yet he had departed from the Presbyterianism of the elder and younger Hodge, and sounded the alarm that American and British Presbyterianism was not that of the Westminster divines. It was then he issued his eirenicon,

[6] Oxford: Mowbray & Co., 1914.

[7] Op. cit., p. 10.

[8] Cf. *The Papal Commission and the Pentateuch.* By the Rev. Charles Augustus Briggs and Baron Friedrich von Hügel (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1906). For the Modernism of von Hügel, cf. "A Catholic Contributor to the Britannica", by the present writer, in ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Jan. 1912; also *Recent Bible Study*, ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, Sept. 1913, pp. 365 ff.

[9] On the career of Dr. Briggs, cf. our study "The Christ of Union Theological Seminary", ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, September, 1916, pp. 318 ff.

called *Whither*.[10] The purpose of the study was to show how the churches could be brought together. "The Church of England is entitled to lead. Let all others follow her lead and advance steadily toward Christian Unity."[11]

So, too, Dr. Gore conceives the Church of England—a church in which there is plenty of elbow room for all who desire "to move and think and act for themselves". Yes, in his brand of *catholicism*—universalism, he means—ministers may even go the length of "some solutions of intellectual difficulties proposed in *Foundations*". These *solutions* "might be regarded as tentative proposals". However, as the basis of fellowship among Anglicans, the bishop wishes some sort of belief in the Virgin birth and the resurrection of the Saviour.[12] What sort? If he accepts the ideas of *Foundations*, or even tolerates them, any sort of belief in the Virgin birth and resurrection will do, provided it fall short of *expressed* blasphemy. These doctrines may be glossed over by verbiage at Oxford; and no objection will be raised to the "tentative proposals", so long as they do not explicitly deny an article of the Apostles' and the Nicene creed. That seems to be Dr. Gore's "Basis of Anglican Fellowship".

II. Oxford "Foundations". Mark well the attitude toward *Foundations, a Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought: by seven Oxford men*.[13] The book had just appeared in Bishop Gore's diocese. It had caused a *furore*. The collaborators were six Anglican clergymen and a layman: the Rev. N. S. Talbot, Fellow, Tutor, and Chaplain of Balliol College; the Rev. R. Brook, Lecturer in Theology at Merton and Oriel Colleges; the Rev. B. H. Streeter, Lecturer in Theology at Queen's and Hertford Colleges; the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, Tutor of Keble College; the Rev. R. G. Parsons, Principal of Wells Theological College, formerly Prælector in Theology of University College, Oxford; the Rev. W. Temple, son of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Headmaster of Repton, formerly Fellow and Lecturer in Philosophy, Queen's College, Oxford; and W. H. Moberly, Fellow and Lecturer in

[10] New York: Scribner's Sons, 1889.

[11] Op. cit., p. xi.

[12] *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship*, p. 19.

[13] London: Macmillan, 1914.

Philosophy of Lincoln College. Among these writers were four of the Oxford clergy to whom Bishop Gore was addressing his charge. What are some of the *solutions*, which these Oxford men propose and Bishop Gore implicitly tolerates? We subjoin just a few.

1. *The Divinity of Christ is denied.* The Rev. William Temple is not rude and crude, but misleading and seemingly reverential in this denial: "Christ is not *a* God (or *a* Divine Being), but God; Christ is not only *a* man, but Man".[14] This is about as clear as some of the twaddle in "Science and Health". We read on; and find that it is all a voluntaristic pantheism. Christ is not a Divine Person, but is impersonal Will. He is Man, writ with a capital **M**., insomuch as Man and God are one. "For, after all, Will is the only Substance there is in man: it is not a part of him, it is just himself as a moral (or indeed 'active') being".

2. *The Christ of Eschatology is allowed.* The Rev. Burnett Hillman Streeter, in his contribution on "The Historic Christ", gives a clever and refined presentation of the revolting trumpery of Schweitzer.[15] The attempt is made to explain as a psychological evolution of our Lord's consciousness all that we believe to have been divinely revealed to His human mind: His Messianic mission, Divinity, etc. Streeter dexterously implies that the cry of dereliction on Calvary was an acknowledgment of the failure of Jesus' apocalyptic expectations.[16] The evolution of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus was all due to hallucination. So, too, the resurrection stories were evolved:

> It is suggested that what the disciples saw was a series of visions caused by some acute psychological reaction—the hopes of which He had raised in their hearts, the impression of His personality upon them refusing to submit to the hard fact of His death. Might not such appearances, retold from mouth to mouth, in the lapse of years be insensibly materialized into the stories in our Gospels?[17]

3. *Christianity is an Evolution due to Environment.* The Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson and the Rev. R. G. Parsons collaborate "The Interpretation of the Christ in the New Testament".

[14] Op. cit., p. 247.
[15] Cf. our study in ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, June, 1915, pp. 735 ff.
[16] *Foundations*, p. 127.
[17] *Foundations*, p. 133.

Their interpretation is one that often obtains among rationalistic Protestants. Things must be taken eschatologically. Christianity began and was evolved "as a doctrine about the Messiah . . . to which the Person of the Founder is irrelevant". If Christianity had been founded as a religion of Jesus, "should we not have expected the early disciples to be known at Antioch not as *Christians* but rather as *Jesuits*?" [18] This eschatological religion was then evolved into Paulinism by contact with Hellenistic mystery religions. Hence Baptism, the Eucharist, all the sacramental and supernatural elements of Christianity are mere borrowings from paganism. Such are the "tentative proposals" that Dr. Gore tolerates as a "Basis of Anglican Fellowship". It is a basis broad enough for the fakir feats of either an Oxford Don or a Holy Roller.

III. Looking Backward. This present crisis in Anglicanism reminds us of similar events in the Church of England fifty and odd years ago. The attitude of Bishop Gore toward *Foundations* so differs from that of Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, in regard to *Essays and Reviews*, in 1861. What a storm ensued, on the publication of that volume! The first essay, "The Education of the World," was by Dr. Frederick Temple, Headmaster of Rugby at the time. The elder Temple had as little respect for revealed religion as his son William Temple shows in *Foundations*. He threw the Bible clean over. It was not a rule of faith:

> It has been matter of great boast with the Church of England, in common with other Protestant churches, that it is founded upon the "Word of God"—a phrase which begs many a question when applied collectively to the books of the Old and New Testaments—a phrase which is never so applied to them by any of the Scriptural authors, and which, according to Protestant principles, never could have been applied to them by any sufficient authority from without. . . . Even if the Fathers have usually considered "canonical" synonymous with "miraculously inspired", there is nothing to show that their sense of the word must necessarily be applied in our own Sixth Article.

Dr. Rowland Williams, in the second essay of the same collection, says that it is absurd to speak of the sacred writers as "inspired," and then to refuse that title to Luther and Milton.

[18] *Foundations*, p. 157.

Logically building upon the Protestant first principle of freedom of private judgment in matters of belief, Dr. Temple substituted the free fling of conscience for the infallible Book:

> When conscience and the Bible appear to differ, the pious Christian immediately concludes that he has not really understood the Bible. . . . The Bible is hindered by its form from exercising a despotism over the human spirit. . . . This it does by the principle of private judgment, which puts conscience between us and the Bible, making conscience the supreme interpreter, whom it may be a duty to enlighten, but whom it can never be a duty to disobey.

Temple means that in a clash between private judgment and the Bible, the dictate of private judgment is certainly right, and the clear teaching of the Bible is certainly wrong. This is a logical outcome from the Lutheran start in religion. Such a principle makes the meaning of the Bible to be what you will; makes as many religions as there are readers of the Bible.

Why, we would not allow of such a principle in regard to the word of man, to say nothing of God's own Word. We would not think of permitting the inner consciousness of each individual to work out its own meaning of municipal, state, and federal laws. We have our municipal, state, and federal judiciary to interpret the law. Not even the President of the United States is allowed to follow an inner voice as the interpreter of the Constitutions. Yet the Constitutions are the word of man. Should we have less respect for the Word of God? Dr. Temple thought so.

Then came the hubbub. Bishop Wilberforce and the Oxford party of the day accused Dr. Temple of heresy. What was the result of the charge, and of the official investigation thereof? Mr. Gladstone, the visible head of the Anglican Church, made him Bishop of Exeter, 1869. Pusey said "the choice was the most frightful enormity ever perpetrated by a prime minister".[19] But Pusey and Wilberforce had to swallow the Temple dose along with Anglicanism. By throwing over the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope, they had accepted Mr. Gladstone as a substitute. So Dr. Temple went his free-lance way; and, spite of all heresy charges, became Archbishop of Canterbury.

WALTER DRUM, S.J.

Woodstock College, Maryland.

[19] *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 26, p. 600, s. v. "Temple, Frederick".

Criticisms and Notes.

COURSE OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION. Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools. THE CATECHIST'S MANUAL: Brief Course, Authorized English Version. Second edition. John Joseph McVey, Philadelphia. Pp. 243.

TO THE HEART OF THE CHILD. By Josephine Van Dyke Brownson. With Preface by the Rev. John J. Wynne, S.J. The Encyclopedia Press: New York. 1918. Pp. 205.

CATECHIST'S MANUAL. FIRST ELEMENTARY COURSE. By Roderick MacEachen, D.D., Instructor in Catechetics at the Catholic University. Catholic Book Co.: Wheeling, W. Va. 1919. Pp. 356.

THE CREED EXPLAINED, according to the Psychological or Munich Method. For Children of the Intermediate Grades. Based on the Baltimore Catechism No. 2. AN AID TO CATECHISTS. By the Rev. Jos. J. Baierl. The Seminary Press, Rochester, N. Y. 1919. Pp. 413.

Gilbert Chesterton alludes somewhere to a singular fancy that has grown up in our time that when things go very wrong with us we need a *practical* man. The witty epigramist would have us look rather for an unpractical person. We need a theorist, a thinker, a man with a doctrine of why things work at all. If it is wrong to fiddle while Rome is afire, it is quite right to study hydraulics at that crucial moment. If your aeroplane is slightly indisposed, a handy man can cure it. But if it is seriously ill, it is all the more likely that some absent-minded professor with wild white hair will have to be dragged out of a college or a laboratory to analyze the evil. The more complicated the smash, the more will the absent-minded, white-haired theorist be needed to deal with the trouble; and in some extreme cases no one but the man (probably insane) who invented the machine, could possibly say what was the trouble with it. Every once in a while—and the whiles seem to be growing more and more unlike angelic visitors—someone becomes painfully conscious that our Catechetics are out of gear; they need mending, and lo! a practical man is called in to do the job. And forthwith he offers us a new catechism and a new method of teaching it. This is not said with a view to decry the multiplication of new books on Catechetics. Quite the contrary. The multiplication of such books may be taken to be a sign of a growing consciousness that our methods of instruction need constant attention lest they grow rusty; and also as a healthy

indication that we are thinking and working with the earnestness befitting so important a subject as the teaching of religious truth. It is with this actuating motive that some of the newest works on the subject in question are here introduced.

The first on the list above can hardly be called new (we have had occasion to notice it before); and if it finds a place here at all, it is because of its preëminence as the embodiment of a sound theory of catechetics. *A priori* we might look for this quality in the Manual, seeing that it is essentially a summary of the principles upon which are based the methods pursued by that noble band of teachers whose religious vocation and life work are primarily consecrated to the religious instruction of youth. We refer, of course, to the Brothers of the Christian Schools.

This *Catechist's Manual* is, in the first place, the work of a learned and an experienced Seminary Professor, and in its present English dress enjoys the perfecting touch of that singularly capable religious educator the late Brother Chrysostom. The work is primarily a text-book for the training of teachers. It is the theoretical methodology of catechetical instruction. Not that it lacks the immediately practical elements. On the contrary, these are sufficiently abundant. But the first and main object of the *Manual* is to form the catechist. For this reason, namely for its theoretical, scientific, philosophical value we have given it the first place on the list above.

The fault usually found with our ancestral methods of teaching catechism is that they assigned too much importance to memorizing. There was too much cramming of indigestible food into the child's cerebral stomach. The pendulum is just now swinging to the opposite side: we would feed our boys and girls on predigested aliments. Midway between these two extremes lies the happy mean. Old Dr. Brownson used to regard it as one of the assets of Catholics born to the faith that they were obliged to learn their catechism verbatim. It gave them a definite form of faith. The *verbum sanum et irreprehensibile* was their conscious possession; a privilege not enjoyed by converts. He was wont to be grateful to the good Bishop of Boston who received him into the Church for obliging him, the profound philosopher, to study the Penny Catechism. The Christian Brothers recognize the importance of exact memorization of at least much of the Catechism, and one of the merits of the present *Catechist's Manual* is that it assigns a reasonable rôle to the faculty of memory.

The second book on the list above comes from the mind and the heart of a cultivated Catholic laywoman. By instinct she knows how to reach the heart of the child. She is not, therefore, solicitous

about theory, though a sound psychology underlies her method. Insight into the child's mind, sympathy with its modes of thought, a charming grace and appropriateness of expression and illustration pervade these religious lessons. The abstract truths grow easily out of the concrete soil, arrange themselves in tabulated order, and fasten themselves in the child's memory by the pictures and diagrams that capture the senses and sustain the imagination. The book is not a manual of Catechetics. It is a collection of exquisite talks on religious subjects, each talk being followed by appropriate questions and illustrations. The book does for religious truth something similar to what Arabella Buckley's *Fairy Land of Science* did in another domain.

Dr. MacEachen's *Catechist's Manual* is of still another type. The book is designed not so much to form the catechist as to help him directly with a practical method of teaching the individual lessons into which the main body of religious truths is divided. Each lesson is divided, for instance, thus:

GOD.

1. God made me.
2. God made all the people in the world.
3. God loves us all.
4. I love God above all things.

Practical instructions are given (in italics) to the teacher how to develop these points, and then under each a very copious collection of questions, mostly of a practical nature, is subsumed. These questions are so abundant that even the dullest teacher need be at no loss for material to elicit the interest and inquisitiveness of the child. Although not every teacher will estimate the work so supremely as to conclude with Bishop Shahan that "the volume presages a new era in catechetical work" (p. 3), there should be no hesitancy in according to it a high degree of excellence and usefulness. Its method is pedagogically, because psychologically, sound. The immensely, almost tropically, varied questioning is calculated to evoke and maintain the child's interest. The exposition is clear and the application of the truths aptly suggestive and practical. Here and there one notices a tendency to overstate things; for instance when it is said, "Of all the works that God allows men to perform in His name there is none more sacred, more sublime than that of instructing children in the divine truths of Faith" (p. 12). This is obviously an exaggeration. Surely God assigns to man functions both more sacred and more sublime than that of instructing children; for instance, saying Mass. Again, it is not true "that nothing grows in the desert (Sahara)" (p. 46). Children learn from their geographies

that, even outside the several luxuriant oases, gum acacias, thorn-bushes, and so on, to say nothing of various types of animal life, are found in the Sahara; and they are apt to lose confidence in their religious instructors who tell them the opposite. Once more, it is neither true to fact nor is it good pedagogy to say to the little ones that, "We (children) don't want others to praise us" (p. 49). We (they) *do* and should want others to praise us; provided, of course, the praise be justified and the *ultimate* motive thereof be referred to God. Hardly less exact is the statement that, "Children are always attracted by humility and sympathy" (p. 12). This indeed ought to be the happy condition of things, but the ideal is by no means realized. Overstatements such as these are not indeed of supreme importance and they are somewhat neutralized by the context. Nevertheless they are out of place in a book which is to be used by teachers who are already by nature prone to exaggerate. Too many of our popular theologies are marred by loose writing and careless inaccuracies.

The author of the fourth book on our list is already well known to his brethren through an excellent little text-book on the Mass. His present work embodies an explanation of the Creed according to the Munich method. The method is called *psychological* because it adapts the learning process which is natural and spontaneous to the teaching of religious truths. It demands in the first place that each lesson shall constitute a *catechetical unit*, namely coördination of the essentially related questions and answers, and such as can be brought under the light of a single story or illustration. In the second place, that the several stages of the learning process be pursued. These are three: presentation, explanation, application. In the third place, that the three adjunct, though non-essential, stages be utilized; namely, preparation, aim, synthesis. How these several stages are to be pursued in the teaching of the Creed is shown at length in the volume. For instance, take the first catechetical unit: *Why did God make you?* The children are first *prepared* by connecting the question with the actual contents of their minds (apperception). In the second place the teacher announces the *aim* he has in view. This in the third place is illustrated by a story (from the Life of St. Philip Neri). The various points of the story in their bearing on the *aim* are then *explained*. These several points are next summed up in a *synthesis*. Lastly, the *application* is made to the child's actual life and daily conduct.

Such is the method in a nutshell. That it is soundly psychological is at once apparent. Beginning with *apprehension* (presentation, apperception), it passes through *understanding* (explanation) and

reasoning to a *synthetic* grasp of the truth in question. The central truth being now thoroughly possessed by the children, the meaning of it for actual life is finally impressed on their minds. Theory and practice, thought and action, are thus happily conjoined and the child is taught literally to *learn to live*, the final end of all true education.

Doubtless to some teachers the method will at first appear somewhat mechanical as well as cumbersome. However, *usus te plura docebit*. Let it be employed for a time; the mechanism will gradually put on the life of the spirit. Its weight will disappear under the agile muscles of the mind and tongue. Moreover, the dividing lines of the several stages will presently shade away into the continuity of the teaching process which seeks unity as the result of the learning process.

Surveying what has been said concerning these four volumes it will be noticed that the first and last are primarily theoretical and subordinately practical. The second and third are primarily practical, subserviently theoretical. The first sings the treble, the fourth the bass: the second, the tenor and the third, the alto, in the catechetical quartette.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PLOTINUS. The Gifford Lectures at St. Andrew's, 1917-1918. By William Ralph Inge, C.V O., D.D., Dean of Paul's; Hon. D.D, Aberdeen; Hon. Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and Hertford College, Oxford; formerly Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. In two volumes: Vol. I, pp. xvi, 270; Vol. II, pp. xii, 253. Longmans, Green and Co.: London, New York, Bombay. 1918.

In selecting the Philosophy of Plotinus as the subject of his Gifford lectures Dr. Inge was influenced mainly by the essentially mystical character of that philosophy, with which character his own favorite line of study accords. (The Dean of St. Paul's is the author of several books on mysticism.) Moreover, he believes that Plotinus has "a message of calm and confidence for the troublous times through which we are passing" — an age no worse, he thinks, than that in which Plotinus lived and in which nevertheless he was able to breathe freely in the timeless and changeless world (the world of "the Eternal Ideas"), "which is the background of the stage whereon each generation struts for its brief hour and then is gone". The object of the Gifford lectureship is to study "the supreme Reality, with which we live and move and have our being"; to consider, moreover, "the duty and destiny of man, determined by his relation with the powers above him". The knowledge, however, im-

parted by these Gifford lectures is to be personal; and not such as depends upon any "external special revelation" or is enjoined by "any sacrosanct authority". To such knowledge, Dr. Inge believes, Plotinus beckons us. Beckons, yet with the warning—"his last word to us"—that "there are parts of what it most concerns you to know which I cannot describe to you; you must come with him to see for yourself. *The vision is for him who will see it.*" We underscore these words because, as a capable critic (William Harris) says, the whole philosophy of Plotinus is "a vision rather than a system". Perhaps we should qualify this by saying that it *terminates at a vision* (as indeed every philosophy should), though it is based upon some sort of system. The system and the vision are analyzed and set forth with considerable insight and with no small apparatus of erudition in the volumes at hand. Conversing intimately, as Dr. Inge has done, with so obscure and elusive a thinker as the father of neo-Platonism, it would be strange if some shadows had not floated into his interpretation from the nebulous heights of the original. As, for instance, where he says that "psychology is a branch of natural science. It may be defined[?] as the science of behavior, or as that part of physiology[?] from which the physiologist is self-excluded by his assumption that all vital functions can be explained mechanically" (p. 3). It is only fair to add that "definitions" of this rather striking character are not so many as one might expect from the nature of the subject, and that where they do occur they are probably meant to be excitant devices which even a Gifford lecturer cannot afford wholly to ignore.

The reviewer would like to give some outline of the vision of Plotinus. But to indulge this propensity would far exceed the just limits of this notice. However, a characteristically clear account is given by Dr. Turner in his *History of Philosophy*, a book accessible to most readers. A fuller and very good outline will be found in Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy* (English translation), and Dr. Inge himself approves the survey made by Windleband. The reader possessed of the elementary information easily obtained from such sources will know what to expect from Dr. Inge's more elaborate treatise.

The Canon of St. Paul's declares himself "not merely a student and critic", but likewise a "disciple" of Plotinus (p. 10), and his work betrays all the ardor of a zealous apostle of a master not wholly unworthy of his loyalty. For Plotinus seems to have been a very good man—pure-minded, unselfish, noble, and devoted to lofty ideals. Indeed, some writers are inclined to think that, despite what seems to be the pantheistic allure of his speculation, he attained to a real, intuitive union with God. And, if we may in a measure agree

with Dr. Inge, "just as the civilization of the Roman Empire, on its moral and religious side, expired in giving birth to the Catholic Church", and "just as on the political side the Cæsars of the West handed over their sceptre not so much to the Holy Roman Emperors as to the priestly Cæsar[!] on the Vatican" (p. 14); so we may say that Pagan philosophy expired in giving birth to neo-Platonism—probably the fairest and the purest, as it was the last, fruitage of the Greek mind. Indeed, St. Augustine himself declares that "the utterance of Plato, the most pure and bright in all philosophy, scattering the clouds of error, has shone forth most of all in Plotinus, the Platonic philosopher who has been deemed so like his master that one might think them contemporaries, if the length of time between them did not compel us to say that in Plotinus Plato lived again". (*Contra Acad.*, 3, 18.) And again, that Plotinus and his friends would have needed but "to change a few words and phrases to become Christians, as many of the Platonists in our generation have done". In the *De Civitate Dei*, St. Augustine mentions these slight changes, though, as Dr. Inge adds, "he criticizes one or two of their doctrines rather sharply" (p. 21).

Be all this as it may, the present author's ardor of discipleship seems, to say the least, excessive, when he attributes Platonism (not technical neo-Platonism; of course, a much subsequent development) to St. Paul's doctrines of Christ as "the Power and the Wisdom of God: of the temporal things that are seen and the eternal things that are invisible; his theory of the resurrection, from which flesh and blood are excluded, since gross matter 'cannot inherit the kingdom of God'; and his psychology of body, soul and spirit, in which, as in the Platonists, Soul holds the middle place and Spirit is nearly identical with the Platonic *Nous* — all show that Christianity, no sooner became a European religion than it discovered its natural affinity with Platonism" (p. 11). All which is highly fanciful and gratuitous in the extreme. Knowing as we do St. Paul's disregard for the *persuasibilia humanae sapientiae verba*, and his contempt for "the wisdom of the Greeks", it is unlikely that in writing, especially to the humbly-born Corinthians, his mind would run into categories borrowed from Plato. We need not go beyond the *Book of Wisdom* for the origin of the Pauline forms of speech; although for that matter the source of such philosophical ideas is not necessarily the mind of Plato, Plotinus, or any other individual philosopher. They float about in the collective consciousness of thinking men. The philosophers do the culling, moulding, chiseling, polishing, and decorating.

Comparing the present Gifford with Dr. Inge's earlier Bampton Lectures, one is tempted to suspect, we hope not unjustly, that some

of the author's predilection for Plotinus lies in the fact that neo-Platonism embodies a doctrine of mysticism which in no wise depends on "sacrosanct authority"; that by the simple use of a faculty "which all possess but few use", man can attain to a mystical union with God that differs in no wise from "the spiritual marriage" enjoyed in every age and clime by the great saints of the Church.

We fail to find in these volumes any satisfactory definition of mysticism. The humble task of defining is not congenial to lofty intellects. However, in his previous Bampton Lectures (*Christian Mysticism*), we read that "mysticism is an attempt to realize the presence of the living God in the soul and in nature, or, more generally, the attempt to realize in thought and feeling the immanence of the temporal in the eternal and of the eternal in the temporal" (Lect. I). This may be mysticism in a loose or analogous sense of the term, but it is something quite other than that which St. Paul experienced when, "in the body or out of the body" he knew not, he saw and heard things "which it is not given man to utter". The consciousness of the Divine in nature which poets enjoy is far removed from the ecstatic absorption in God, into which the Saints were rapt—not by any abstractive effort on their part but by the immediate uplifting power of Him whom they ardently loved and for which absorption fierce crucifixions of "the flesh with its vices and concupiscences" prepared their souls. Even the repeated ecstasies which Porphyrius tells us fell to the lot of his master, may well have been, if not of another species, at least of a far higher degree than that which Wordsworth experienced when

> Sensation, soul and form
> All melted into him; they swallowed up
> His animal being; in them did he live
> And by them did he live; they were his life
> In such access of mind, in such high hours
> Of visitation from the living God,
> Thought was not; in enjoyment it expired.
> No thanks he breathed; he proffered no request;
> Rapt into still communion that transcends
> The imperfect offices of prayer and praise,
> His mind was a thanksgiving to the power
> That made him; it was blessedness and love.

In conclusion, let us add that students of the history of philosophy or of mysticism can find in these volumes many fruitful suggestions. It could hardly be otherwise, seeing that the work is the product of a widely cultured writer who has devoted many years to a task which has been to him at the same time a labor of love. The volumes are equipped with very full analytical tables of contents and indexes. The bibliography relating to Plotinus is included in the opening lecture.

CURSUS ASCETICUS, auctore P. Fr. Aureliano a SS. Sacramento, O.D., M.A., Moderatore Spirituali in Seminario Apostolico Pluthempellensi. Vol. I—VIA PURGATIVA, 1917, pp. 326. Vol. II—VIA ILLUMINATIVA, 1918, pp. 334. Vol. III—VIA UNITIVA, 1919, pp. 308. Ernakulam, Typis Scholae Industrialis.

Whether or not Plotinus enjoyed true mystical communion with God, it is impossible for us to discover. If he did, he is the one case known to us wherein the Creator, acting outside the channels through which he ordinarily communicates His favors, draws, for reasons known to Himself alone, certain elect souls into immediate converse with Himself. It is not impossible that Plotinus, noble-minded, unselfish, pure-eyed—qualities which his contemporaries attribute to him—may have been amongst the chosen ones. *Beati mundo corde quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt.* The ordinary approach to God is through faith; faith that is not a mere sentiment, an emotional trust "that God is in His heaven"—the human heart—and that "all's right with that world" wherein He loves to dwell; but faith which is an assent of the intellect to the truths which God has chosen to reveal to mankind and has committed to accredited witnesses whom through His Incarnate Son He commissions to teach all nations unto the end of time. The genuine mystical state depends ordinarily, therefore, on that "sacrosanct authority" which the theorists of mysticism, such as Canon Inge, are wont to disregard or contemn.

The perfectly mystical life has always existed in the Catholic Church from the time when the Seer of Patmos was rapt up and saw in the light of the Lamb the New Jerusalem, down to the present day when spouses of Christ like Gemma Galgani are given to bear in their mortal body the wounds of the Crucified. Throughout the centuries of her unceasing experience of God's dealings with His favored children keen psychologists of the higher life are seen observing, analyzing, and classifying the phenomena inherent in and connected with mysticism. Trained theologians, experts in such matters, have induced from those phenomena certain laws or rules according to which they occur. The phenomena systematized, together with the laws which they logically imply, constitute the object matter of Mystical Theology, which, when viewed from the side of the spiritual discipline that prepares for and accompanies mystical experience, is called Ascetical Theology, a branch of sacred science immediately subordinate to Moral Theology. The Latin work introduced above contains a full course in Ascetic Theology adapted for seminarians—not less for their own guidance than for their subsequent office as spiritual directors in the priesthood.

The first volume deals with the fundamentals of all truly spiritual life—self-discipline, the removal of the things and conditions that hinder union with God. Plotinus himself made much of the necessity of purgation from sin, vice and passion, for those who would hold converse with the One, the Good, the Absolute—the terms he was wont to use when speaking of God, and which cause many of his interpreters to characterize his philosophy as thinly veiled pantheism. In the Catholic Church, however, penance for sin and the cleansing of the faculties from the effects thereof are reduced at once to a science and an art; the science being based on psychology and morals; the art on the rules of prudence—natural and supernatural. The outlines of this science and art are given in the volume above on the *via purgativa*. They are, of course, substantially the same as those contained in most other books of the kind, and with which the present reader may be supposed to be acquainted from his Scaramelli, Rodriguez, Lallemant, and the other masters of the spiritual life. Perhaps some of the rules, like those given, for instance, by Scaramelli and by the author before us for the mortification of the senses and the passions, are more adapted to other times and climes than to our own. And certainly some of these ascetical practices would do much more harm than good should a director attempt to apply them to the American temperament. Books of this kind, however, are to be prudently used, not slavishly followed. Some of the positive means of perfection, such as prayer and self-examination, are also explained in this volume.

The second volume, treating of "the illuminative way", considers the virtues, theological and cardinal, and such means as spiritual reading and the practice of the Divine Presence. The latter exercise prepares the way for the subject matter of the third volume—the *via unitiva*. Here we are at the very heart of the mystical life, the intimate union of the soul with God in the state of contemplation and the undivided love of conformity. The nature of this state, the various acts of the soul leading up to it, coëxisting therewith, and following therefrom, are explained in some detail. The extraordinary phenomena, such as rapture, ecstasy, visions, revelations, are likewise, of course, described and their relationship to genuine mysticism made plain. Dr. Inge in his Lectures on Plotinus carps *ad nauseam* at what he calls "the mysticism of the cloister", and at the prominence given by Catholic authorities to these extraordinary accompaniments of mystical experiences. The Gifford lecturer knows full well, and *en passant* confesses it, that no Catholic authority of weight considers them either as belonging to the essence of mysticism or as possessing any great intrinsic importance or value. He appears, however, to hold "the mysticism of the cloister" in such contempt that he fails

to discern the really essential element of genuine mysticism, as a supernatural state, one not evoked primarily, much less solely, by the human faculties, but by God Himself supernaturally uplifting to Himself the spirit of man. Dr. Inge, we fear, has an instinctive dislike for the "sacrosanct authority" of Catholicism.

So far as the substance of the present *Cursus Asceticus* is concerned, it is practically identical with the average work of its class. What commends it particularly are its method and style. Intended to serve as a text-book, the essential points of the several parts are given in italics, each point being developed in the immediately subsequent paragraphs. As regards the style, nothing could be more perfect. True scholastic as he is, the author adopts that perfectly transparent medium which, like the Latin of St. Thomas, allows the thought to shine forth without the faintest cloud or shadow.

The work has apparently been compiled for use by seminaries in which the youth of the author's own religious family (the Discalced Carmelites) are trained. Our diocesan seminaries can hardly afford time for a special course in Ascetical Theology. Nevertheless, amongst the duties of the spiritual director of these institutions should be the giving of lectures on this subject. It would not be easy to select a better text-book on which such lectures might be based—and which in this connexion might so well serve for private Spiritual Reading—as the one here provided. The volumes, being small and convenient, lend themselves very nicely to this purpose.

THE MYSTICAL LIFE. By Dom S. Louismet, O.S.B. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1917. Pp. xiv—128.

MYSTICISM—TRUE AND FALSE. By Dom S. Louismet, O.S.B. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1918. Pp. xiv—153.

The Latin work on Ascetical Theology reviewed above is technical in matter and manner, being designed for the use of specialists, in the training of religious and spiritual directors. The purpose of the present book is to popularize Mysticism. For, as those will remember who have read Dom Louismet's former volume on the *Mystical Life*—a work previously reviewed in these pages (November, 1918, p. 557)—the author, in common with many other Catholic writers, conceives of the mystical state as "the love of God", or more explicitly, the "Mystical Life is simply a conscious, sustained, loving attention to God, under the veil of faith, in the sanctuary of its own heart; in other words, the intercourse of mutual love between God and the fervent Christian" (p. 144). He opposes this, "the wider Catholic definition, to the more modern and narrower definition, very much in favor to-day both with Catholic and non-Catholic writers,

which confines mystical life within the circle of extraordinary, miraculous phenomena" (p. 16). With the former of these definitions—taking the latter term in a loose sense—all Catholic authorities will agree. The mystical state of whatsoever degree consists essentially in love, though just as is the case of the beatific vision, whereof indeed the mystical state is the anticipation, the act of the intellect is the primary and the radical element. The mystical state is, first, contemplation of God and by *consequence* love of God.

As regards the other notion of mysticism—what the author terms "the more modern (?) and the narrower definition", which "confines the mystical life within the circle of extraordinary, miraculous phenomena" (visions, revelations, ecstasies, raptures and the like), no Catholic authority of any weight would place mystical experience in these unwonted phenomena. Such phenomena are psychological effects which may indeed and often do accompany the mystical state. But whether they spring from a primarily natural, preternatural, or supernatural cause, it is often difficult and sometimes impossible to determine.

The essence of all true mystical experience consists in spiritual communication with God by the intellect and will. The other psychic powers—sense, imagination, feeling (appetition)—may or may not coöperate in this spiritual union. In the highest states, such as the great contemplatives, like St. Bernard, St. Teresa, and St. John of the Cross, enjoyed, these subordinate activities fall away either in part or entirely and the soul, anticipating the unveiled Vision, sees God intuitively. This intuition is of course of necessity purely supernatural and can therefore be brought about by no emotional uplift or flight of fancy such as poets enjoy, or by no "precisions" of the active intellect, such as certain philosophers experience when they commune with the Absolute, the One, the Real, and the other big-capitaled projections of the mind.

Obviously there are countless degrees of knowledge and love leading up to the supernatural contemplation and unitive love of God. The book before us is not concerned with this higher, or highest, plane of union, nor with the attendant experiences of the soul. Its task is humbler and more general. The author would win all men to the love of God; would show that union with Him is attainable by every Christian who chooses to place the conditions whereon the divine attraction depends. These conditions are on the whole more negative than positive. They consist in removing the hindrances to unitive love—namely, tepidity and sin. The major part of the present book is taken up with an explanation of these obstacles. A volume which the author has in hand will probably treat of the positive aspects of the mystical life, namely with the acts and states

whereby the soul under God's drawing secures and develops that life. While, then, the present book is entitled "True and False Mysticism", it says little about either pseudo-mysticism or about the specious theories which constitute the large and ever-growing literature of the subject. As in his preceding book on the *Mystical Life*, so here the writer's aim is mainly practical and educative.

FROM CLOISTER TO CAMP. Being Reminiscences of a Priest in France, 1915-1918. By Fr. Dominic Devas, O.F.M., author of "A Modern Franciscan". With Frontispiece and Maps. Sands and Co.: London and Edinburgh. 1919. Pp. 199.

STANDING BY. WAR-TIME REFLECTIONS IN FRANCE AND FLANDERS. By Robert Keable, author of "A City of the Dawn", etc. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1919. Pp. 271.

The experiences of army chaplains are unlike those of other men who write of the great war now happily over. If they depict the horrors of destruction, hatred, suffering, and death, as witnessed on the field, in the trenches or the hospitals, their records are lit up by the nobler motives of religion that drew them into the service of fellow and foe alike. Their revelations are those of the soul life in a setting that brings to the surface the best and probably also the worst in human nature. To the priest, especially the young priest, these records, if true and just, are of great value, insomuch as they enlarge the outlook on human weakness and on human greatness which a confessor realizes in his limited missionary ministrations.

What the chaplain himself definitely learns while in the military service, apart from the details of army organization, is the necessity and value of discipline — obedience, order, punctuality, attention to the business in hand, responsibility and, most of all, respect for authority. Priest of the Most High though he is, he is also part of a society which demands service, without shirking or insubordination, and acceptance of hardships not only without complaint but with spontaneity and generosity in fellowship. To these qualities of the soldier he must add, of his own store and accord, the resourcefulness of the fisher of men. Preaching, saying Mass, hearing confessions, and administering Extreme Unction, though of their essence the most important, are in reality the least of the elements that make a successful army chaplain. What attracts the soldiers to him, so as to make them avail themselves of these sacramental graces, is his power to draw them to the light, to interpret their spiritual dullness, and to turn it to account by his largemindedness and tact. The cross on his collar or lapel must mean for him that he is willing to spill his blood not merely for a cause but for every man engaged in its defence, even though he bear himself neither sword nor gun.

The two volumes before us give us a glimpse of these things. They show their importance under two entirely different aspects. Father Devas's book is a sort of diary in which he notes the incidents of his service in regular sequence, and the impressions which men, things, and places made on him at the time. His active ministry begins as chaplain to the South Midland Field Ambulance, comprising the Gloucestershire and Worcestershire Brigade; and later on during 1918 he is put in charge of the Royal Munster Fusiliers. One gets an excellent idea from these notes of what a chaplain with the British troops was expected to do. Father Devas dwells less upon his work as a priest as such, although that fact alone gave importance to the rest of his duties. He briefly comments on the hardships, dangers, and casualties which came under his personal observation in the region of the Somme, about Ypres and Armentières, and later at Arras and Cambrai. There runs a cheerful note all through the harrowing details of life in camp, dug-out and actual battle, arising from what he calls the great joys of army life. "The army was like some vast brotherhood; friendly hospitality one could meet with almost everywhere, and no matter what a man's belief or profession or antecedents, life in their company was almost wholly pleasant." Of two facts Fr. Devas became strikingly conscious while in the English army. One was "the prevailing ignorance, not simply of Catholicism, which one might expect, but of Christianity and religion in general. I can only describe it as abysmal beyond all conception." The other was the total ignorance and absolute indifference regarding conditions in Ireland. "When the Munsters came to the division, the Irish question was one not infrequently discussed; but I don't think I ever met in the army a single Englishman, even amongst those most ready to lay down the law, who had even the remotest idea of Irish history, or of English history in its relation to Ireland, or who ever attempted to gain any insight at all into the Irish point of view or to study the characteristics of the Irish people. Like religion, it was not thought worth while." Yet Fr. Devas, who passes this judgment, is by no means an opponent of British rule.

Quite a contrast in form as well as matter, though illustrative of the same theme, and lit up by the same lurid light of war, with fitful flashes of humor around the campfires of good fellowship, is *Standing By*. Not a diary is this, but a series of well-drawn pictures, with reflections of men and things, both forceful and original. Whilst the author does not profess allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church, he sees things through the eyes of a shepherd who would give his life for the dark African soldiers to follow whom his sense of religious duty and his patriotism brought him from Basutoland to the

danger line in France and Flanders. As a minister of the Church of England, which he believes to be an integral though discredited part of the great body of the Catholic Church, he maintains the service of pre-Reformation days. Accordingly he says Mass, teaches his Basutos to reverence the Blessed Sacrament, says the rosary of the B. V. M. and bids them make their confession before going to battle. And all this he does with evident sincerity and in no spirit of aloofness. He finds himself thoroughly at home in the Catholic churches of France, leads his Kaffirs to hear Mass and pray in them at the manger on Christmas night. The Catholic army chaplains whom he meets he finds models for imitation. He freely contrasts their efficiency with the inadequacy of Protestant ministers. Nor are his pictures of Catholic life merely ideal, such as one would wish things to be in their perfection. He knows how to account for and to discount the apparent inconsistencies, the shadows and blemishes noted by critics. He sees things with the clear eyes of nature's unspoiled vision. His life among the simple children of Africa has made him keenly alive to the artificial conventionalities of civilized society in England and France. There is an independence of judgment, a freedom of speech, coupled with a generous benevolence that is neither sentimental nor partial. The author's views of the merits of the war, of the terms of peace, of the functions of democracy, of the church and the clergy in the work of reconstruction, are as free from bias as they are well expressed. In some twenty-odd pictures, some intensely interesting and rich in natural coloring, all more or less uplifting and of spiritual value, the author touches the most vital problems of modern life. We might quote, but there are too many good things in this volume thus to do justice to it. Few priests who read this book will fail to experience a sense of grateful acknowledgment to the author for what he says. Though he approaches closely the danger line at times where delicacy meets prudishness, one realizes that what the author states is sincere and in all likelihood literally true. The book furnishes fine argument against the errors of Protestantism, Anglicanism, and the false notions of democracy which are the stock-in-trade of newspaper moralists. Most of the stories are particularly fascinating in their realism, while yet elevating and instructive.

THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY. By Charles Gore, D.D., Bishop of Oxford. New Edition revised by C. H. Turner, M.A. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1919. Pp. 414.

This is a book of contrasts. Up to a certain point it gives evidence of sound reasoning and clear thinking; then, the author's

vision becomes clouded and distorted by prejudice; all his logic goes to pieces and his arguments are fallacious and specious. For the existence of an episcopal ministry and the necessity of an apostolic succession in the Church, the author makes some strong and very telling points; but, withal, he gains nothing for the Episcopalian position. At this juncture, the inconsistency of the writer and his utter want of logic are glaring and painfully evident. To vindicate the Episcopalian position, he would have to establish the right to differ within the Church. For such a right, however, not even a shred of evidence can be discovered in Christian antiquity. It was never admitted. The unity of faith and of organization were jealously guarded; the dissenting church would not claim the right to dissent within the Church, but would maintain the claim of being the one, undivided, and true Church. Unity was regarded as essential. The Anglican position has no precedent in early Church history. It is something entirely new and can only be defended by a curious dialectical twist, almost Hegelian in its defiance of the ordinary laws of logic. To refute the author, we need not seek a new argument; all we have to do is to prolong the lines of his own argument and to push it to its inevitable and legitimate conclusions.

The author insists much on the fact that the Church is a visible society and that its unity somehow also is visible. A society, however, cannot be one except through some organ and principle of unity. But when the society is visible, this principle itself must be visible. From the monarchical episcopate, there is only one step to the monarchical primacy. How near the author comes to this conclusion appears from the following passage: "No doubt it may be urged, and with partial truth, that the real unity of the Church lies in the Spirit, which lives in her, and in the truth she holds and teaches; but that truth was committed to a society, as to what Irenaeus calls 'its rich depository', and that Spirit has a body—and how can the outward organization, which enshrines and perpetuates the inner life, maintain or exhibit its identity without some such bond as the apostolic succession of the ministry affords?" The only flaw in this argument is that it does not go far enough. Followed out to its natural conclusion, it would lead us to the Catholic conception of ecclesiastical unity.

The inherent self-contradiction, which vitiates the whole argument set forth so speciously and with such a show of learning, is even more apparent in another passage, which deserves to be quoted. It reads: "The ministerial principle, then — the sacerdotalism which cannot be disparaged or repudiated—means just this: that Christianity is the life of an organized society in which a graduated body of ordained ministers is made the instrument of unity." Where, how-

ever, is the bond of unity which binds together this body of ministers; and does not a graduated body require a head of some kind? The author, in this passage, establishes the hierarchical principle which obtains in the Catholic Church, but which he, with an utter disregard of logic, rejects.

Further illustration may be dispensed with. The Anglican position is untenable. It collapses in the face of history, but, what is more interesting, it is undermined by its own logic. Of course, as many others, the author takes refuge in the famous branch-theory. As understood by the Anglicans, however, it is a most fantastic makeshift and cannot save the situation. Branches are branches only when they are united in one trunk. Branches are not autonomous. They live not a life of their own in beautiful isolation, but live by the life of the whole tree, and this life flows into them by very visible channels. In no intelligible sense can the Anglican and the Catholic communities be called branches of one Church. To call them so does violence to language and stultifies our intelligence. The branch-theory is a counsel of despair, the sorriest expedient to escape a blind alley that has ever been invented.

Scant comfort does Anglicanism derive from the Donatist schism. History proves that the attitude of the Donatists differs essentially from that of the Anglicans. The cases are not parallel, as has been pointed out frequently and as Dr. Adrian Fortescue shows very clearly in his essay on Donatism.

The learning of the author we do not wish to discredit, but it is employed in a hopeless cause. Yet his work will be read with profit by the student of these intricate questions; the scholar, of course, cannot ignore it. The recent edition takes account of the later developments of the controversy. C. B.

THE GOVERNMENT OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES. A Commentary on Three Chapters of the Code of Canon Law. Preceded by a Commentary on the Establishment and Suppression of Religious Communities. By Hector Papi, S.J., author of "Religious Profession", Professor of Canon Law, Woodstock College. P. J. Kenedy & Sons: New York. 1919. Pp. 214.

The legislation *de Religiosis* in the new Code comprises nine titles (IX–XVII). On the third of them (XI) Father Papi has previously written a commentary (*Religious Profession*) that has proved highly serviceable to those whom it particularly addresses. The work before us reverts to the tenth title and includes that portion of the eleventh which relates to the government of religious communities. The volume opens with an explanation of the canons wherein

are laid down precise notions regarding the nature, kinds, and the organization of religious institutes. The main body of the work consists of a commentary on the title which concerns the establishment and suppression of religious communities (the latter term extending to institutes, provinces, and houses) and on the title relating to the government of such communities, distinct sections being devoted to superiors, their appointment, obligations, rights, and duties. Next follows a chapter on confessors and chaplains of religious communities, and a third on temporal goods, the rights and obligations of administering them, the responsibility in contracting debts, and other obligations. The grave importance of the subjects constituting such a program is self-evident. As we have learned from his former work, Father Papi is a master of clear, precise, and terse expression. There is no ambiguity in the terms in which he translates the canons, themselves so concise and meatful in their legal formulation, while his commentaries on the text are models of lucidity. Whether or no the canons of the ecclesiastical Code, like those of secular legislators, be broad enough to admit of driving through them four abreast, one may hesitate to decide. But whatever may be thought on this head, it would certainly take a driver of O'Connell's skill in handling the reins to accomplish the feat in the present case. And the thing becomes more nearly impossible when the legal highway is marked out with the preciseness and stretched out with the comprehensiveness which it bears as it runs between the boundaries of the present volume.

LETTERS TO TEACHERS, and other Papers of the Hour. By Hartley Burr Alexander, Professor of Philosophy, University of Nebraska. Chicago and London: Open Court Publishing Co. 1919. Pp. 253.

The object of these *Letters to Teachers* is to illustrate and enforce by argument the aims of public education for the training of qualified citizens. The means to attain this end are comprised in what is called a liberal education, that is the cultivation of certain qualities of mind and heart embodying a love and understanding of truth, virtue, and beauty. The atmosphere in which these qualities grow must be one of freedom, securing guidance from above, but being slow to permit dictation.

In the arrangement of studies the author assigns a first place to mathematics. "The most direct road to a knowledge of right and wrong, true and false, is *via* arithmetic." In other fields of knowledge persuasion is needed to convince one of the right, or to demonstrate the true. In mathematics the process is one of discovery, of undeviating truth. It implies a moral lesson.

Next comes the study of English, which means the best classics, and in this sense it should extend from the first reading years to the end. "Read what will make you think; not what will make you dream." An adjunct to the study of English is the study of other languages. Among them our author does not hesitate to assign the first place to Latin. It is the key to the largest store of history and literature of use to the cultured mind. It is the key to the understanding of fundamental English. It is the best taught language, and a single year of its study results in better knowledge of right thinking for speech than can be derived from the study of other languages. Next comes French, as nearest, in form and habit, to English. Then Greek among the ancient and German among the modern languages. But you must study these languages for the purpose of reading, not merely as a mental discipline or for the sake of philology. Their cultural value lies in the understanding of their literature.

For the study of History the author suggests the "time-form" by Archbishop Usher, which is excellent; though we would suggest, in view of modern criticism, the omission of exact dates for the Creation (4004) and the death of Adam (3074). As an important feature of this study the author introduces the topic of the Bible as immediately related to the humanities and history. "The two great sources of ideas at the foundation of European civilization are the Greek and the Hebrew. Obviously he who would understand the modern world must be familiar with its great beginnings in the literature and records of these ancient peoples." But it is not merely for its historical significance that the study of the Bible is important; it must also be regarded "as a great and moving record of human experiences, which time has shown to possess the most profound power to mold the sentiments of mankind". Furthermore, there is the literary value of the Bible. Its English translations have been more influential in shaping not only the thought but the style and mode of expression of English-speaking peoples, for centuries. The Bible is the most read book in the world, and no one pretending to culture can afford to be ignorant of its scope and form.

In this connexion our author adverts to the value of the study of the Latin Vulgate which is the basis of all our English translations. Its influence, too, upon the Christian literature of the Church in the writings of the Fathers is worthy of close attention, at least on the part of students at our universities. This reflection naturally leads Professor Alexander to speak of the Bible as a religious book. "Dare the schools tamper with the great source of religious instruction more or less jealously interpreted by the many groups of Christian sectaries?" Our Constitution forbids the teaching of sectarian inter-

pretation of the Bible or of any other book as religious teaching. How, then, are we to treat knowledge of the Bible as a vital element in a sound liberal education? Our author answers the question: "How should Bible study be handled in our Public Schools?" by suggesting that Biblical history may be taught as part of ancient history and as a clue to the interpretation or understanding of all history. Furthermore, that chapters or passages of the authorized version, omitting comment, might be read from the "Authorized Version", the language value of which has been admitted by scholars of all classes and religious convictions. The objection to this comes as a rule from Catholics on the valid ground that the "Authorized Version" is a garbled translation in which the so-called "reformers" have designedly introduced mistranslations for the purpose of sustaining their opposition to the pre-Reformation doctrines and traditions of the Catholic Church when the English state church was first organized. We cannot here argue the question as to its present merits; but the old objection to what is called the "Protestant Bible" has lost much of its force since the last revision of 1883, which largely corrected the traditional bias of the "reformers" and treated the translation as a matter of philological accuracy more than as a defence of the Protestant position. There are of course limitations to this improvement; but on the whole Catholics have little or nothing to fear from the use of the Bible in the public schools as a vindication of distinctly sectarian doctrines. As a matter of principle, remembering what the Protestant version represents when set against the Catholic version of the Vulgate, we object to its use in schools supported by taxes from Catholic and non-Catholic citizens alike. The objection may in time give way to a compromise, especially if a new translation under Catholic auspices were to show that the "revised" translations of non-Catholics do not represent opposition to the Catholic doctrines but merely a variant of an original that has both an historical and a moral value for civilization. None of our translations as such is faultless or infallible, since inspiration covers the thought, not the words, of the original. If it be recognized on all sides that the contents of the Bible are of immense value to the development of the intellectual and moral character of the growing generation, a compromise alike honest and useful to the commonwealth may be found to accept it as an aid to the proper training of the citizen.

There are some admirable and practical suggestions in this book touching "system" which exaggerates the enforcing of "standards" and implies much servility to texts and methods, against which our author rightly warns teachers. He points out the necessity of making teaching not a temporary chore, but a lifework which demands long

and intimate service; of establishing confidence and friendship between pupil and teacher; of cultivating taste rather than artifice in the aim after beauty; and of regarding "the redeemableness of the common man which Jesus made the prime article of the Christian faith" as the noblest of human efforts. "The soul of all that is Christian in Christendom is the *Imago Christi*." Whilst written from the non-Catholic point of view, the volume contains so much that is good and helpful to the Catholic teacher that it fills a place in our pedagogical libraries not easily supplied by works of similar trend and scope.

Literary Chat.

Among the various criticisms that have recently appeared of *Pastor Halloft* we note the following as of special significance because it comes from an experienced priest and appears in the September number of *Pastoral Blatt*, an ecclesiastical organ which has for more than fifty years held up the standard of high ideals and practical studies in the priestly life. Says the writer:

"During the process of formation in the seminary the young cleric eagerly looks for ascetical works to inform and steady him in his spiritual life. Very naturally he gets hold of books which contain matter that does not readily reflect modern views of life. Hence many a cleric leaves the seminary with wrong notions about important issues in the priestly life. I wish that every seminarist, undertaking the task of caring for souls, would read *Pastor Halloft*, not once but over and over again, until he has thoroughly mastered the principles on which this story is built up. The book, although idealized biography, is based upon actual fact. It is a manual of pastoral theology and priestly asceticism in form of a novel. As such it contains much practical wisdom without being didactic; and it is full of such delightful humor that anyone who has once opened it is sure not to lay it down until he has read it to its last line. . . . I believe that the study of *Pastor Halloft* is of more profit to a seminarian, and furnishes him with more practical knowledge touching intensive training in modern pastoral and ascetical science, than lengthy lectures from the professors of theology."

The Annual Report of the Association of the Holy Childhood for the year ending 30 April, 1919, indicates that the spirit of missionary zeal for the salvation of souls abroad is not confined to local propaganda. The Central Director, the Rev. Edward Knaebel of the Holy Ghost Fathers at Pittsburg, reports receipts of $119,827.70 in answer to the last appeal. This sum is used for the support of 280 missions directed by various congregations comprising every nationality. Pagan children are saved from death or slavery by purchase, and are baptized and educated in the Christian faith. Half a million dying children are baptized annually, and some six hundred thousand more are educated in about 17,000 establishments. The Catholics of the United States furnish at present about one-fourth of the total income of the Association.

Fr. D. J. O'Sullivan, Missionary Apostolic of the Nile Delta, has written a *Life Sketch of Mother Mary Lawrence*, an American Missionary Sister who, to quote from the preface by the Rev. Dr. McGlinchey, Director of the Boston Society of the Propagation of the Faith, "toiled out her young life in China, where she recently died a martyr to her devotedness and zeal". The booklet pictures

indeed a life far more heroic than that of most soldiers who, returning from the battlefield or leaving their bodies there after a brief struggle, are heralded as glorious victors in an earthly conflict. The book is published as an incentive to imitation and as proof that those who support the Society do not make their offering in vain. The illustrations as well as the text show the Sister, Marie Comtois, who was born in Canda in 1880, to have been singularly attractive in appearance as well as in character. She entered the Order of Franciscan Missionaries of Mary at the age of twenty-four. In 1912 she was sent to Rome as Mistress of Novices. A year and a half later she went to Manchuria. The poor, the sick, the aged, and the orphan were to be her charge, and she labored with characteristic devotion for their bodily and spiritual welfare. In Passion Week of 1817 she was taken ill, the result of her daily strenuous service in the cause of charity. On Holy Thursday, when about to die, she thought she heard strains of the choir singing, and called her nuns to unite in the chant. She wished in her own death to give her children a foretaste of happiness as the end of a life of sacrifice. (Propagation of the Faith, 25 Granby St., Boston.)

The *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* (Fasc. I–II) for 1918, published by the Franciscan Fathers at Quaracchi (Florence), is rich in discussions and valuable documents of special interest to the historian. Fr. Deodat Marie de Basly, O.F.M., in a very remarkable study examines the internal and external evidence to test the authenticity of the "Theoremata" attributed to Duns Scotus by Wadding and others. His conclusion is that, as a whole, the work is spurious and cannot safely be credited to Scotus. Among the documents are two noteworthy sermons of St. John Capistran about promoting the study of science among the Observantes.

The *Catholic World* for September is an exceptionally readable number. Brother Constantine in a leading paper shows that the principles and rules laid down in St. Jean Baptist de la Salle's *Management of Christian Schools* stand for all time and are equally applicable to the teaching of higher studies and to the elementary schools. Margaret Munsterberg's exquisite literary interpretation of Francis Thompson as a poet for poets capable of awakening spiritual sympathies of the highest order, and a thoughtful essay by H. E. G. Rope, on "Remoteness", emphasize the value of Christian ideals in the reconstruction of modern life. The editor's appeal for the missionary cause, in the article "Maryknoll and the Far East", eloquently reminds us that "the old Faith is still the redemption of the world".

Father T. Gavan Duffy in his June Letter from India (*Hope*, vol. II, 1) gives us a further glimpse of his schools. It is harassing work compared to which our inland missions are paradise. He records both failure and success. Of the latter the school at Nangathur is an encouraging instance. The secret of the success of this school is, he says: "First of all, the pastor cares; secondly, the teachers prepare". The former may be taken generally for granted in India. The latter not so, in view of the native indolence of lay teachers on whom the priest depends.

The Catholic Hospital Association announces the publication of *Hospital Progress* as the official organ of its activities. The Catholic service represents sixty per cent of the entire capacity of all hospitals in North America. Hence there is a good field for the new monthly. (Hospital Progress, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.)

Among the more important books held over for review in a future issue, particular mention should be made of *The Ethics of Homicide and Mutilation*, by Dr. Austin O'Malley. The topics treated lie on the borderland between the moral and the biological sciences. Dr. O'Malley, the readers of this REVIEW need scarcely be told, is at home in this region as well as in the contiguous domains. Besides his expert knowledge he enjoys the gift of clear, vivid, and even picturesque expression. So that his essays on the

difficult subjects he has taken in hand will be found hardly less interesting and refreshing than instructive. The book appeals equally to priests and physicians. It is well documented and indexed, and worthily issued by the Devin-Adair Co., New York.

Whatever be one's attitude toward Prohibition, one cannot but recognize the weighty argument in its favor, even while protesting against the excess and the fanaticism that are seen in some of the campaigning efforts of its protagonists. Those who, whether favoring or opposing the policy of Prohibition, aside from its mode of propaganda, want to see a many-sided and unusually forceful plea in its defence, will find it in *The Sober World*, by Randolph Wellford Smith. The author is an experienced journalist and writes with the directness and concreteness characteristic of his craft.

That Prohibition is chiefly propelled by women, and that to them is largely due the success it has attained, requires no proof. The following dialogue, however, may be cited as a concrete example *ex quo disce reliqua:*

"I'm deuced if I know how I can get to my room," said a Senator of the United States to the writer a few years ago.

"What's the matter?" I asked.

"Well, every turn I make I meet a committee of women who want to know how I stand on this liquor question."

"Can't you tell them?"

"No," was the curt response. "I can't. I don't exactly know how my constituents stand, and I am representing them here and not representing myself."

"Why not tell these women the position you are in?"

"I have told them."

"What did they say?"

"They said they would give me six months to make up my mind how I stood."

"The six months are up and I can't get to my committee room," the Senator said, with disgust.

I walked away with a natural feeling of contempt. Two years later the Senator's term expired. A few months before its expiration I met him on Broadway, New York. "I see you were defeated."

"I was."

"Who did it?"

"The women."

Then the Senator, who had a long and rather useful career, locked his hands about my arm and asked me to join him in a drink at the Knickerbocker Hotel. He was calm and his words were prophetic.

"I tell you," he said, "not only this country but the whole world is going dry, and those that are going to be responsible for this new condition and this new world are women. I am with them now, but it is too late. When they came into my district they told me they were going to do it. They gave me six months to make up my mind whether I was going to vote for or against liquor. At the expiration of that time they came into my district with a quarter of a million dollars, and the way I suffered is now a matter of history. And I respect and love and admire them for it. At that time I couldn't see my way clear to vote against the men who had elected me, mostly men interested in one way or another in liquor."

"Do you mean to say that you were elected to the United States Senate by the liquor interests?"

"No, I don't mean to say any such damn thing. I mean to say simply that all the best people in my community are not necessarily allied with the liquor interests, but the vast majority of them were so involved with the liquor interests that after all it was liquor that elected me and I thought that I had to stand by my friends. Now, if I had the thing to do over again and I thought I was going to pass the rest of my natural days in the poorhouse, after watching what these women are accomplishing, I would readily work with them and help them in every way. As it is, as an outsider, I am doing the best in my power for them."

This is all no doubt true and "punchful", as far as it goes. The question still remains, however, as to who were back of the women. Did they initiate the movement, or are they but the untiring fighters inspired and urged forward by men who are de-

terminedly pursuing a certain policy of governmental control whereof Prohibition is but one plank in its platform? Mr. Smith does not of course discuss this point, since it is alien to his object and purpose. In respect to that purpose, however, he leaves nothing worth while unsaid. On the other hand, one could wish that in his pleading the cause of the Sober World he had himself shown an example of sobriety. His argumentation is, unfortunately, weakened by a most intemperate *display of racial feeling*. Moreover, breweries have already enough to answer for without loading upon them the weight of the war that Mr. Smith would force them to carry. *A propos* of this, was it really "a half-tipsy Irish statesman" that asked Disraeli to what he, "the most talented and brilliant of all British diplomatists", owed his "startling and nearly always enduring achievements", and drew from the famous premier the answer: "I owe what success I have had in this world to a sober mind"? Possibly it was. It is significant, however, that "the half-tipsy" seeker of wisdom from the sober English statesman should happen to have been *Irish*, even as the sodden beer-guzzler is always and everywhere a Teuton! John Bull, as all the world knows, always prefers plain water to brandy and soda, and Uncle Sam invariably asks for lemonade when Kentucky whiskey is offered him. *N'est ce pas?*

Mr. Smith is fortunate in his publishers, The Marshall Jones Company, Boston.

It is fondly to be hoped that one of the results of the great war will be a more amiable—we were going to say fraternal — feeling between the members of the international family of mankind. Perhaps this is expecting rather much in view of the fact that the representatives of the nations seem to have left entirely out of count the First Law on which is based the Second. What may be looked for with more confidence will be a quickened and more general interest concerning the origin and historical vicissitudes of the various races and nations. It is in the light of this hope that Father Skelly, O.P., has written an essay on the *Origin of the Celtic Race*. The essay is embodied in a small pamphlet of only thirty pages, but these relatively few leaves are packed with a very large amount of interesting and valuable information, to obtain which one would have to search through many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore. Much has been said and sung on the origin of the Celt, but Father Skelly brings together facts and inferences that will be new to most people who are not specialists in the matter, while those who would like to pursue the subject further can consult the literature to which he refers.

In the September number of this REVIEW there appeared a brief characterization of Kenelm Digby taken for the most part from Mr. Holland's *Memoir* of that illustrious champion of the Ages of Faith. The spirit of Digby, so delicately sympathetic to all that was noblest and most chivalrous in the *Mores Catholici* of those ages, repeats itself from time to time in modern writings, but in none more deeply, or with more charm of beauty, than in Ralph Cram's *The Substance of Gothic* and in several of his briefer essays — one on the *Significance of Gothic Art;* another on *Architecture in Relation to Civilization;* and a third, a study translated into French under the title of *La Cathédrale de Reims*. We have repeatedly had occasion to commend in these pages Dr. Cram's truly Catholic views on religion and philosophy, views so Catholic indeed that one not experienced in the mysteriousness of the workings of the human spirit and of divine faith must wonder how they can be compatible with the non-profession of Catholicism. (Boston, Marshall Jones Co.)

While Kenelm Digby imbibed the love of medieval idealism chiefly from the manners and customs of the people as reflected in literature, Dr. Cram sees it glorified and in turn glorifies it as embodied in Gothic architecture. Those who desire to see or rather to feel—or perhaps still better to understand intelligently and philosophically —the medieval mind, cannot do better than to read the works just mentioned. By their aid Christianity is seen at

work creating for itself a world as nearly as possible after its own image, a world, as the writer recognizes it, which, "in spite of the wars and the desecrations, the ignorance and the barbarism, and the 'restorations' of modernism, has left us monuments and records and traditions of a power and beauty and nobility without parallel in history."

Next to the terrible slaughter of human life, the war has wrought no havoc comparable with the destruction of these monuments, a ruin which seems to be symbolical of a collapsing civilization. On the other hand, the wide desolation of war may, as Dr. Cram seems to think, turn out to be the clearing of the field for the return of the spirit and the mode of life that begat "the Gothic Art of Catholic Europe". And in this event "the price exacted from the world will not be too great a price to pay for so glorious a restoration."

What priest has not found himself at times puzzled by the queer names which he is called upon by parent or sponsor to impose upon the head of a child with the infusion of the baptismal water? Puzzled either by the unaccustomed sound, or, if solicitous for saintly patronage in the child's behalf or by the doubt whether there be in the Church's roll of canonized heroes any such hallowed name as the one proposed, what would you do, for instance, if a fond mother from down East desired that her baby be called *Sukey?* Was there ever such a name on the sacred dyptichs? No; but there is a Susanna. Sukey is just the modern endearing appellative for the venerable and sedate Hebrew. *Lib* is short for Elizabeth; just as *Mawkes* is the unseemly disguise of Mary. There is a Saint answering to *Garrett*, but the original is Gerald, even as *Pancho* does duty for Francis.

A book that would help a priest out of these uncertainties has recently appeared (in a second edition revised and enlarged) with the title *Baptismal Names*, by Joseph L. Weidenham, S.T.L. (Washington, D. C.: Chas. H. Potter & Co.). It embodies names used in America, England, Scotland, and Ireland; their synonyms, variants, derivation; their pet forms, abbreviations, contractions, corruptions; likewise the French, Italian, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, Polish, Bohemian, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish forms of the more common names.

Not only all this, but the day on the Kalendar proper to each name is likewise added. Having such a book on his table a priest need never be in a quandary as to patronal names for Baptism or Confirmation.

Of course, Charlotte Young's *Christian Names* still retains its unique value by reason of its wealth of general information regarding the origin and meaning of names. The present volume, however, is serviceable as a handy source for quick reference.

The neat little pamphlet *The Pope and the War* is, on the one hand, an indication of the enlightened zeal that actuates The Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia which has compiled and issued the booklet and, on the other hand, a valuable conspectus of the Holy Father's War Work. The pamphlet contains a digest of *The Pope's War Work* issued by the America Press; the brochure in turn having been compiled from the *Civiltà Cattolica*. Being a handy and an attractive little publication, it lends itself easily to wide circulation.

Catholics suffer from no dearth of Prayer Books. They possess an almost embarrassing plenitude of devotional helps, and there would seem to be neither place nor demand for any accession to the already abundant supply. However, a unique manual of devotions has just appeared which fills a niche of its own. It is entitled *Moments with the Consoling Christ*, and consists of prayers selected from Thomas à Kempis. Everyone knows what a wealth of prayers is comprised in the *Imitation;* but one hardly realizes their wide range or their rich variety, until one sees them assembled and grouped as they are in this beautiful little volume. Solid, thoughtful, fervent, these appeals from the heart of sanctity will serve for both vocal and mental prayer. The latter adap-

tation is facilitated by the suggestive headings under which they are grouped. The work has been compiled by Dr. John Dillon, Superintendent of the Parish Schools of the Newark Diocese and is published by Schwartz, Kirwin & Fauss, New York.

Catholic France still remains a puzzle to very many inquirers. Is France as a whole Catholic at all? Many think not, and they base their opinion upon what they read in the secular press and upon the reports brought back from the war by chaplain and soldier alike. From these two sources they seem to find sufficient grounds for judging that France in the large is at best but indifferently Catholic, at least in practice.

On the other hand, the flood of doctrinal literature unceasingly flowing from the French press bids us pause before yielding to so gloomy a decision. Apart from the copious war literature, much of which has shown a spiritual trend, though perhaps most of it is ephemeral, the number of books of a doctrinal and devotional character that have been issued in France during the recent years is so large that one is at a loss how to explain the output unless there be an adequate demand. This demand would in turn seem at least to imply that there must surely be a vigorous Catholic life in a country that can support so copious a Catholic literature. The inference is obviously by no means apodictic. Some degree of verisimilitude is all that can be claimed for it.

Amongst the quite recent French books that seem most worth while may be mentioned *Le Renouveau Catholique* by M. Louis Rouzic. The book deals with the religious and moral life of the French youth prior to the war. It surveys the chief causes of the collapse of faith during "les tristes années quatre-vingts", namely the pseudo-scientism of the positivists and agnostics, on the one hand, and the neo-Christianism of the dillettante criticists and litterateurs (the author gives a list of these writers), on the other. The evil influence of these forces seems to have died down by the opening of the present century, and M. Rouzic discerns a revival of faith setting in from that date, and the substance of his book is made up of an analysis of the elements, the marks, and the cause of "the renovation". The work is a study of the French youth of education. It considers the youth before the war alone. A second volume considering them during the war, and a third after the war, are preparing and are promised for the near future. Judging from the present portion, which is characteristically French in its large, illuminating ideas and fruitful suggestiveness, the work will probably make the problem of Catholic life in France less perplexing and the outlook more hopeful. (Paris, P. Téqui.)

Apologétique Chrétienne by the Abbé Duflot belongs to a class of books of which there are not a few in French, and a growing number in our own language. The subject matter comprises *Revelation and the Church*, which two central themes it develops on the lines and method familiar to students of Fundamental Theology. The work, while adding nothing particularly new, commends itself for its lucidity, conciseness, and precision. There is no haziness in its atmosphere, no superfluity in its material, no inaccuracy in its definition or exposition. It is a model of good method, and a priest will find few if any better texts available for apologetic lectures or sermons. (Paris, P. Téqui.)

A more than ordinarily solid and comprehensive yet withal popular work on the Church is *L'Eglise: Constitution et Droit Public*, by J. Louis Demeuvan, D.C.L. Of particular value are the treatment of the interrelations between Church and State, and the subject of Concordats. Upon neither topic is there room or call for much originality. The merit here consists in the presentation of the traditional doctrine and themes with singular distinctness and precision. The volume is well documented and furnished with analytical contents and index, the latter equipments being rather a rarity in French books (Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne).

From the third issue of the National Catholic War Council *Bulletin* we learn that "substantial progress" is being made by the nation-wide campaign of the N. C. W. C. and other welfare organizations to stop the poisoning of the souls of the youth of our country by the plague of commercialized sex films which have been rushed out by unscrupulous film producers under the widely advertised auspices of the U. S. Public Health Service. The efforts of these protesting organizations are evidently earnest and searching, but the chief outcome appears to be that the U. S. Health Service disclaims responsibility for the commercialized spread of the films, though its disclaimer amounts to nothing in reality since the Service endorses and recommends the indecent films as educational media.

It is a matter for congratulation that the N. C. W. C. is taking up the positive side of the moving picture entertainment, determined to utilize to the utmost the educational value of the film. Plans and methods have been arranged for teaching civics to the illiterate millions, and the Catholic history of America to the people generally. The outlook in these directions as projected by the *Bulletin* is most encouraging.

Many priests are likewise coming to see that the best way to counterpoise the abuse of the moving pictures is to employ them as educational and entertaining instruments. Accordingly parish halls are being equipped with the requisite apparatus which, it may be hoped. will become in time part of the educational equipment of every well-organized congregation. In this as in every other progressive undertaking the financial problem has to be solved. That the problem is not so difficult, however, as it may appear to some, is demonstrated in a small volume entitled *Showing Movies for Profit*—in School and Church. Practical suggestions on the matter are given by an experienced writer, the editor of *Reel and Slide* magazine, Mr. Lyne S. Metcalfe. The book is issued by *Class Publications*, 418 S. Market St., Chicago, Ill.

The Illinois Catholic Historical Magazine has passed its first milestone in splendid form. There is an air of health, vigor, determination to make good, in and about it. It deserves the success it has attained and Catholics everywhere, but especially of course within its parent State, will wish it Godspeed on the second year of its journey. But magazines are not built on good wishes. More substantial foundations are needed for their support. These have not been wanting to the Chicago periodical, though they have been laid not without much sacrifice on the part of those who have had at heart the interest of this worthy auxiliary of Catholic truth and progress in the "Prairie State".

The Day of Glory is the title story of a collection of sketches relating to the writer's (Dorothy Canfield's) experiences of war times in France. *Le jour de gloire est arrivé* when the cannons boomed and the bells rang out the news of the signed armistice. Briefly but intimately the writer tells of feelings that surged and things that happened in Paris on that memorable occasion. With rare insight and sympathy she penetrates into the French character and in a style no less admirable she depicts its splendid and noble qualities. Not quick to find the mote in her neighbor's eye—be the eye that of the French or of the American soldiery—she stresses the lights rather than the shades of the war incidents.

"On the Edge" is an exquisite story of home life, typical doubtless of many French mothers and their children while the father was at the front. France's "Fighting Woman Doctor" (Girard Mangin) is the story of a heroine such as we are taught to expect from the homeland of Jeanne d'Arc. The chapter on Lourdes contains as true and as beautiful a picture of the characteristic feature of devotional life at Lourdes—the processions—as will be found in all the vast literature descriptive of Our Lady's shrine at Massabielle. *The Day of Glory* is published by Henry Holt, New York.

The Catholic Home Annual for 1920 contains. as usual, a goodly sheaf of

rich grain for mind and heart. While keeping Catholics in close touch with the round of the Church's feasts and fasts, this long-established *Annual* retains its high standard of literary excellence and all-around informing value. (New York, Benziger Brothers.)

The Life of St. Columbanus, by George Metlake, author of *Christian Social Reform* (Dolphin Press, 1914), has been reproduced in German (B. Herder, Freiburg). The author introduces his volume by a letter of St. Columbanus to the monks of the monastery at Luxeuil, showing that Irish leaders in the sixth century stood as stoutly for the cause of liberty, to be defended by thoughtful bravery, as in the twentieth.

"Cognosce causam belli,
Fortem non nescias hostem
Et libertatem in medio arbitrii.
Si tollis hostem, tollis et pugnam;
Si tollis pugnam, tollis et coronam;
Si tollis libertatem, tollis et dignitatem."

(*S. Columbani Abbat. Epist. ad Fratres Luxov.*)

The same author is engaged upon a history of St. Boniface, for which he has made years of careful study in Europe.

Fr. Ferreol Girardey, C.SS.R., has made a translation of portions of P. Willi's *Le Bréviaire Expliqué*, of which work the French author announces a second revised edition. The chapters selected by his American confrère, in order to give us a taste of a fuller work later on, discuss the excellence, fruits, and economy of the Divine Office. Whilst the original is somewhat discursive, it illustrates by apt reflections the value of the Breviary not merely for the personal sanctification of the cleric but as a medium of reconstruction in the social and economic order. (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis.)

Books Received.

SCRIPTURAL.

A Book about the English Bible. By Joseph H. Penniman, Ph.D., LL.D., Vice-Provost and Professor of English Literature in the University of Pennsylvania. (*Religious Science and Literature Series.* Edited by E. Hershey Sneath, Ph.D., LL.D.) Macmillan Co., New York. 1919. Pp. ix—444. Price, $2.35.

Les Saints Évangiles de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ. Traduits littéralement d'après le texte latin de la Vulgate et les plus anciens manuscrits grecs. Avec quelques notes explicatives. Par T. de Wyzewa. Perrin & Cie., Paris. 1919. Pp. ii—403. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50 (majoration temporaire 30%).

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

Moments with the Consoling Christ. Prayers Selected from Thomas à Kempis. By the Rev. John A. Dillon, LL.D. With Foreword by the Right Rev. John J. O'Connor, D.D., Bishop of Newark. Schwartz, Kirwin & Fauss, New York. 1918. Pp. 159. Price, $0.75 and $1.25.

The Priest's Canonical Prayer. From the French of the Rev. Charles Willi, C.SS.R. By the Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C.SS.R. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. 1919. Pp. 66. Price, $0.50.

Der hl. Kolumban. Sein Leben und Seine Schriften. Von Johan Joseph Laux, Priester der Kongregation vom hl. Geist. Mit 7 Bildern. Freiburg: B. Herder. 1919. Pp. 290. Kart., M. 7.80.

La Sainte Eucharistie. Par Abbé Jean Rumel, Chapelain de N.-D. de Pipet. Deuxième édition. Pierre Téqui, Paris. 1919. Pp. 294. Prix. 3 *fr.* 50 (majoration temporaire 30%).

DE CONFERENDA ABSOLUTIONE SACRAMENTALI juxta Canonem 886 Codicis Iuris Canonici scripsit Franciscus Ter Haar, C.SS.R. Desclee & Socii, Romae. 1919. Pp. 69.

APOLOGÉTIQUE CHRÉTIENNE. La Révélation. L'Église. Par Abbé Léon Duflot, Chanoine d'Arras. Pierre Téqui, Paris. 1919. Pp. xi—400. Prix, 4 *fr.* (majoration temporaire 30%).

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE ETHICS OF MEDICAL HOMICIDE AND MUTILATION. By Austin O'Malley, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D. Devin-Adair Co., New York. 1919. Pp. x—273. Price, $4.00 *net.*

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GOTHIC ART. By Ralph Adams Cram, Litt.D., LL.D., F.A.I.A., A.N.A., F.R.G.S. (No. 1 of *Occasional Pamphlets bearing on the World after the War as this appears through Study of the Past or Conditions of the Present.*) Marshall Jones Co., Boston. 1918. Pp. 31. Price, $0.15; $10.00 a hundred.

ARCHITECTURE IN ITS RELATION TO CIVILIZATION. By Ralph Adams Cram, Litt.D., LL.D., F.A.I.A., A.N.A., F.R.G.S. (No. 2 of *Occasional Pamphlets bearing on the World after the War as this appears through Study of the Past or Conditions of the Present.*) Marshall Jones Co., Boston. 1918. Pp. 30. Price, $0.15; $10.00 a hundred.

THE SUBSTANCE OF GOTHIC. Six Lectures on the Development of Architecture from Charlemagne to Henry VIII, given at the Lowell Institute, Boston, in November and December, 1916. By Ralph Adams Cram, Litt.D., LL.D., F.A.I.A., F.R.G.S., etc. Marshall Jones Co., Boston. 1917. Pp. xviii—200. Price, $1.50 *net.*

A PLAN FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF MIDDLE EUROPE. On the Principle of Partition without Annexation. By Ralph Adams Cram, Litt.D., LL.D., Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society. (No. 3 of *Occasional Pamphlets bearing on the World after the War as this appears through Study of the Past or Conditions of the Present.*) Marshall Jones Co., Boston. 1918. Pp. 24. Price, $0.25.

L'INSTRUCTION OBLIGATOIRE. Principes et Conséquences. Par P. Hermas Lalande, S.J. Imprimerie du *Messager*, Montréal. 1919. Pp. 151. Prix, 40 *sous.*

HISTORICAL.

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY. Its History and Objects. By Hugh Fraser Mackintosh. Catholic Truth Society of Canada, Toronto. 1919. Pp. 18. Price, $0.02 *postpaid.*

MESSAGES, DISCOURS, ALLOCUTIONS, LETTRES ET TÉLÉGRAMMES DE M. RAYMOND POINCARÉ, PRÉSIDENT DE LA RÉPUBLIQUE. 31 Juillet 1914—17 Novembre 1918. Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1919. Pp. 319.

LE RENOUVEAU CATHOLIQUE. Les Jeunes avant la Guerre. Par Louis Rouzic. Pierre Téqui, Paris. 1919. Pp. 337. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50 (majoration temporaire 30%).

LA CATHÉDRALE DE REIMS. Hier—Aujourd'hui—Demain. Conférence faite pendant l'hiver 1917-1918 et publiée par *The Yale Review* en Octobre 1918. Par Ralph Adams Cram, Litt.D., LL.D., F.A.I.A., A.N.A., F.R.G.S. Traduite par Madeleine Fabin, certifée de l'enseignement secondaire. Marshall Jones & Cie., Boston. 1918. Pp. 24. Prix, $0.25.

HEURES D'UNE MÈRE. 1914-1918. Par Anda Cantegrive. Perrin & Cie., Paris. 1919. Pp. xi—276. Prix, 3 *fr.* 50 (majoration temporaire 30%).

LA FRANCE, LES ALLIÉS, ET L'ALLEMAGNE. Devant la Doctrine Chrétienne. Par Mgr. Chapon, Évêque de Nice. Pierre Téqui, Paris. 1919. Pp. 153. Prix, 2 *fr.* (majoration temporaire 30%).

LA GUERRE ET LA VIE DE L'ESPRIT. Par Maurice Legendre. Bloud & Gay, Paris ou Barcelone. 1918. Pp. 195.